

Why Did the Northern Kingdom Fall According to 2 Kings 15?

The fall of Samaria and consequently the end of the Northern Kingdom has become the object of several scholarly investigations. Most scholars have focused on the reconstruction of the events, i.e. on political and social history ¹. The biblical books describe the fall of the Northern Kingdom from different angles presenting it in accordance with the cultural views and theological beliefs of biblical authors and redactors. In particular, prophets such as Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah offer various sociological and theological reasons why the Northern Kingdom collapsed. 1–2 Kings play a special role among the biblical books dealing with the fall of the Northern Kingdom. 2 Kings 17 and 18,9–12 not only describe basic events in their characteristic annalistic style (17,3–6.23–24; 18,9–11) but also offer a theological reflection that by means of the Deuteronomistic theologies explains the reasons for the fall of the Northern Kingdom (17,7–22; 18,12). There are, however, few scholarly writings dedicated to 2 Kings 15 that would aim at understanding the dynamics latent in the society of the Northern Kingdom, which, I believe, ultimately led to its fall ².

¹ B. BECKING, *The Fall of Samaria*. An Historical and Archaeological Summary (Leiden 1992) 21–104; G. GALIL, “The Last Years of the Kingdom of Israel and the Fall of Samaria”, *CBQ* 57 (1995) 52–64; J.L. HAYES – J.K. KUAN, “The Final Years of Samaria (730–720 BC)”, *Bib* 72 (1991) 153–181; B.E. KELLE, “Hoshea, Sargon, and the Final Destruction of Samaria: A Response to M. Christine Tetley with a View toward Method”, *JSOT* 17 (2003) 226–244; N. NA’AMAN, “The Historical Background to the Conquest of Samaria (720 BC)”, *Bib* 71 (1990) 206–225; M.C. TETLEY, “The Date of Samaria’s Fall as a Reason for Rejecting the Hypothesis of Two Conquests”, *CBQ* 64 (2002) 59–77; K.L. YOUNGER, “The Fall of Samaria in Light of Recent Research”, *CBQ* 61 (1999) 461–482.

² Besides the major commentaries the following studies treat this chapter from different angles: F. CLANCY, “Jotham and Shallum: a Redactor’s Choice”, *SJOT* 26 (2012) 289–302; M. COGAN – H. TADMOR, “Ahaz and Tiglath-pileser in the Book of Kings: Historiographic Considerations”, *Bib* 60 (1979) 491–508; A. FAUST, “The Shephelah in the Iron Age: A New Look on the Settlement of Judah”, *PEQ* 145 (2013) 203–219; M. HARAN, “The Rise

2 Kings 15 was composed after the events had taken place, and therefore it contains a post-event reflection heavily marked by the interpretative patterns of later redactors and editors. Moreover, this reflection is disguised in the literary cloak of that time. Therefore the goal of the following study is to get behind the rhetoric of 2 Kings 15 and to summarize the elements which I believe caused the downfall of the Northern Kingdom. Lastly I will contextualize these results comparing them with some examples taken from the ancient Near East.

I. *Coups d'état* in 2 Kings 15

The following paragraphs focus on a fixed formula the final redactors employed to describe *coups d'état* that ravaged the Northern Kingdom. Analyzing this formula and other dynasty changes in the Northern Kingdom we can point to the first reason indicated in 2 Kings 15 for the fall of the Northern Kingdom — its political instability.

The literary motif that permeates 2 Kings 15 is *coup d'état*: Shallum organized a conspiracy against Zechariah (15,10), Menahem organized a revolt against Shallum (15,14), then Pekah conspired against Pekahiah (15,25), and finally Hosea conspired against Pekah (15,30). It may be noticed that scribes repeated a stereotyped formula, i.e. the sequence of verbs נכח, מות, and מלך, in order to describe the *coups d'état*. In three cases the formula is preceded by variants of the verb קשר, whereas in the case of Menahem the formula is preceded by the verbs עלה followed by בוא³. The investigation into this “fixed” formula⁴ shows that the formula,

and Decline of the Empire of Jeroboam ben Joash”, *VT* 17 (1967) 266-297; J. TINO “Nelegitimná náboženská prax biblického Izraela versus inšpirácia”, *Izraelský monoteizmus v kontexte dejín Starovekého blízkeho východu* (eds. M. KARDIS – D. SLIVKA) (Prešov 2008) 84-85.

³ For the meaning of this change and the discussion of the formula see P. DUBOVSKÝ, “Menahem’s Reign before the Assyrian Invasion (2 Kings 15:14-16)”, *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature* (eds. D.S. VANDERHOOF – A. WINITZER) (Winona Lake, IN 2013) 29-45.

⁴ G.M. TUCKER, *Form Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, PA 1971) 14.

even though maintaining the three verbs in *wayyiqtol*, is quite flexible and other details can be added to it (see below).

Keeping in mind the flexibility of this formula we can add two other *coups d'état* that took place in the Northern Kingdom: the conspiracy of Baasha against Nadab (1 Kgs 15,27-28) and the conspiracy of Zimri against Elah (1 Kgs 16,9-10). Besides these six *coups d'état* two other changes of dynasties should be mentioned to complete the picture of the dynastic succession in the Northern Kingdom: the ascent of Omri and the conspiracy of Jehu (2 Kings 9-10). The former describes the moments following immediately after Zimri's *coup d'état* (1 Kgs 16,15-22) ⁵. The usurper Zimri, probably because he was unable to face Philistine military pressure, lost the support of the people who proclaimed king Omri commander of the army ⁶. Omri besieged Tirzah, and Zimri, finding himself locked in the keep of Tirzah, burnt himself to death. After Zimri's death the kingdom was split between Tibni and Omri. The people following Omri overcame the people of Tibni and we learn that Tibni died ⁷. Omri being already proclaimed king became the founder of a new dynasty. Even though Omri's ascension to the throne bears several signs of a *coup d'état*, there are several reasons to conclude that the ancient scribes did not classify it as a *coup d'état*. First, Omri was made king by the people (1 Kgs 16,16). Contrary to the fixed formula the verb in this case is in *hiphil* plural וַיַּמְלִכוּ and it is not followed by a prepositional phrase as in other cases of the *coup d'état* וַיַּמְלִךְ PN תַּחֲתֵי. Second, his attack on Zimri's seat Tirzah took place after Omri became king and therefore could be considered as one of the "heroic deeds" of the new king. Third, the description of the reign of his rival Tibni contains no regnal résumé ⁸ to introduce and to conclude the narrative on Tibni. I see the omission of both regnal résumés as a sign that the reader should not consider the short reign of Tibni to be the start of a new

⁵ M. COGAN, *1 Kings*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 10; New York 2001) 418.

⁶ A.F. RAINEY – J. UZZIEL, *The Sacred Bridge*. Carta's Atlas of the Biblical World (Jerusalem 2006) 195-199.

⁷ Tibni's death is described as "he died", which could also mean by a natural death.

⁸ B.O. LONG, *1 Kings*. With an Introduction to Historical Literature (FOTL 9; Grand Rapids, MI 1984) 259.

dynasty ⁹. Finally, it was not Omri but the people of Israel who eliminated Tibni's followers. These reasons suggest that Omri's ascension to the throne should not be understood as a *coup d'état*. For this reason, Tibni is also not listed in the following table, and his removal from the throne is not considered a dynastic change.

The last dynastic change to be evaluated is Jehu's revolt and his extermination of Ahab's dynasty (2 Kings 9–10) ¹⁰. Neither in this case can we speak about the stereotyped formula of a *coup d'état*. The narrative starts with the anointing of Jehu, and therefore the extermination of Ahab's dynasty can be considered one of the "heroic deeds" of a new king as in the case of Omri. However, the narrative contains several elements that prompt an attentive reader to notice the literary motif of *coup d'état*. After an introduction describing how the officers proclaimed Jehu king, the narrator characterizes Jehu's ascension to the throne as a conspiracy (2 Kgs 9,14). After this narrative comment, the narration continues with a lengthy description of bloodshed. In 2 Kgs 10,9 Jehu himself defines his *coup d'état* as a conspiracy and assumes the responsibility for the death of the king Jehoram, using the verb נכּה. Finally in 2 Kgs 10,36 the narrator informs us that Jehu ruled over Israel for 28 years (מלך), considering him a true king. In sum, 2 Kings 9–10 contain the basic elements of a *coup d'état*: Jehu conspired against the king (verb קשר: 2 Kgs 9,14; 10,9), he struck down the kings of Israel and Judah and other members of the royal family (verb נכּה: 2 Kgs 9,24.27; 10,9.11.17.25), he killed them (instead of the verb מוּת the verb הרג ¹¹ is used: 2 Kgs 10,9), and finally Jehu became the king in Samaria (the verb מלך: 2 Kgs 9,1-13; 10,36). These elements indicate that, even though we cannot speak about the formula of *coup d'état* being used by them, the final redactors classified the story as a conspiracy narrated in the style of a story (*Erzählung*) ¹².

The following table relates the series of *coups d'état* to the dynasty changes:

⁹ In the case of Shallum, despite the fact that he reigned only for one month the résumés are still given (2 Kgs 15,13.15).

¹⁰ S. HASEGAWA, *Aram and Israel during the Jehuïte Dynasty* (BZAW 434; Berlin – Boston, MA 2012) 12-35.

¹¹ This variant is used in 2 Chr 24,25.

¹² LONG, *I Kings*, 261.

	King	
	Jeroboam	
	Nadab	
Dynasty change I.	Baasha	<i>Coup d'état</i> (formula; 1 Kgs 15,27-28)
	Elah	
Dynasty change II.	Zimri	<i>Coup d'état</i> (formula; 1 Kgs 16,9-10)
Dynasty change III.	Omri	Not a <i>coup d'état</i> (1 Kgs 16,16-22)
	Ahab	
	Ahaziah	
	Jehoram	
Dynasty change IV.	Jehu	<i>Coup d'état</i> (narrative; 2 Kings 9-10)
	Jehoahaz	
	Jehoash	
	Jeroboam	
	Zechariah	
Dynasty change V.	Shallum	<i>Coup d'état</i> (formula; 2 Kgs 15,10)
Dynasty change VI.	Menahem	<i>Coup d'état</i> (formula; 2 Kgs 15,14)
	Pekahiah	
Dynasty change VII.	Pekah	<i>Coup d'état</i> (formula; 2 Kgs 15,25)
Dynasty change VIII.	Hoshea	<i>Coup d'état</i> (formula; 2 Kgs 15,30)

If we place Menahem's and Jehu's *coups d'état* into the same group as those defined by a stereotyped formula of conspiracy, then the conspiracies and revolts in the Northern Kingdom amount to seven. The number seven indicates totality, completeness, and fulfillment¹³. It seems that the number seven was employed in order to convey the idea of completeness, i.e., the totality of the *coups*

¹³ Cf. for example Gen 2,2; 4,24; 7,4; 41,2-54; Exod 7,25; 16,26-27; etc.

d'état that took place in the Northern Kingdom. Consequently the real number of the *coups d'état* could have been different. When the seventh *coup d'état* occurred, the instability of the Northern Kingdom reached its peak.

Moreover, an interesting accumulation of *coups d'état* can also be observed. While the first three *coups d'état* are spread over almost 200 years, the last four took place within 20 years. Thus, the instability of the Northern Kingdom culminated in a geometrical progression. A kingdom exposed to four *coups d'état* within a span of 20 years is hardly able to absorb them in such a short period of time. On the other hand, the long description of Jehu's conspiracy and bloodshed gives the reader a good idea of how much blood must have been shed in those last 20 years.

In conclusion, by means of this literary device the biblical text points to the first cause of the downfall of Samaria. The instability of the Northern Kingdom, caused by frequent conspiracies and revolts, reached its peak, and consequently it was only a question of time before the entire kingdom would also reach its end.

II. Gradual deterioration of the kingdom

The preceding analysis shows that the narrator in order to underline the impending fall of the Northern Kingdom in chapter 15 accumulated four *coups d'état* and described them by means of a stereotyped formula. This formula forms a skeleton upon which some additional comments (marked below) are hung. In order to bring out these comments, which I believe bespeak further reasons for the fall of the Northern Kingdom, I will investigate three elements that vary in the stereotyped formula in the case of the first three *coups d'état*: the place of conspiracy and the type of usurpers on the one hand and the narration time on the other.

Shallum's *coup d'état* (15,10):

וַיִּקְשֹׁר עָלָיו שָׁלֹם בֶּן־יִבְשָׁהוּ וַיִּכְהוּ קָבֵל־עָם וַיִּמְיתוּהוּ וַיִּמְלֹךְ תַּחְתָּיו

Menahem's *coup d'état* (15,14):

וַיַּעַל מְנַחֵם בֶּן־גִּדִּי מִתְרַצָּה וַיָּבֵא שִׁמְרוֹן וַיִּךְ אֶת־שָׁלוֹם בֶּן־יִבְשָׁהוּ בְּשִׁמְרוֹן וַיִּמְיתוּהוּ וַיִּמְלֹךְ תַּחְתָּיו

Pekah's *coup d'état* (15,25):

וַיִּקְשֹׁר עָלָיו פֶּקֶחַ בֶּן־רַמְלִיָּהוּ שְׁלִישׁוֹ וַיַּכְהוּ בְּשִׁמְרוֹן בְּאַרְמוֹן בֵּית־מֶלֶךְ
 [וְהַמֶּלֶךְ] אֶת־אַרְגָּב וְאֶת־הָאֲרִיָּה וְעַמּוֹ חֲמִשִּׁים אִישׁ מִבְּנֵי גִלְעָדִים וַיִּמְתְּהוּ
 וַיִּמְלֹךְ תַּחְתָּיו

The first type of additions inserted between the verb מות and נכה concerns the location where the *coup d'état* took place. Shallum's conspiracy against Zechariah is described with the term קבלעם vocalized as קְבֶלֶעַם (2 Kgs 15,10) in *Codex Leningradensis*. The vocalization קְבֶלֶעַם suggests that the expression קבלעם is composed of two words קבל and עם. In this case קבל could be taken as an Aramaic preposition "in front of, before". This interpretation can be found in various forms in some Greek manuscripts and is followed by most translations: "he struck him before the people", i.e. "in public", "publicly"¹⁴. According to this interpretation of the term קבלעם the location of the first *coup d'état* is not specified. However, it was not a secret operation but rather a public event, i.e. approved by the people, if not even with the people's participation. Conversely, the Antiochian version offers a different solution of the problem. It has the verbs in the singular and the expression קבלעם is interpreted as εἰν ἰεβλααμ "in Ieblaam" (manuscripts bore₂ 9). These manuscripts suggest interpreting the problematic expression as a location. Even though the geographical location Ieblaam has not been identified, understanding the term קבלעם as a geographical term should be preferred to reading it as the Aramaic preposition קבל meaning "in front of (the people)", i.e. "publicly"¹⁵. According to this interpretation of the term קבלעם the location of the first *coup d'état* took place outside Samaria, in a place known to the reader from 2 Kgs

¹⁴ In particular in manuscript c₂. The *Codex Vaticanus* (B) has the verbs in the plural "they conspired [...] they struck him down" and the subjects should be Shallum and probably Keblaam. This interpretation becomes more evident in other Greek manuscripts, in particular, in the *Codex Alexandrinus* (A) that read Σελλουμ υἱος Ιαβεῖς καὶ Κεβλααμ καὶ ἐπατάξαν αὐτον κατευναντι του λαου (see also manuscripts xy² 35). Some manuscripts invert the order of the proper names of the people involved in the conspiracy κεβδααμ καὶ σελλημ ο πηρ αὐτου καὶ ἐπατάξαν αὐτον (manuscripts ghjnuz 27).

¹⁵ M. COGAN – H. TADMOR, *II Kings*. A New Translation (AB 11, Garden City, NY 1988) 170-171; T.R. HOBBS, *2 Kings* (WBC 13; Waco, TX 1985) 197; A. SANDA, *Das zweite Buch der Könige* (EHAT 9/2; Münster 1912) 171-173.

9,27 or Judg 1,27 (LXX). The location of the second revolt is clear. Menahem came to Samaria and killed Shallum in Samaria ¹⁶ (2 Kgs 15,14). The third conspiracy also took place in Samaria, in particular, in the keep of the royal palace (2 Kgs 15,25) ¹⁷.

By means of these additions the MT emphasized how the conspiracies and revolts spread around the kingdom. The first *coup d'état* took place in public, in a place undisclosed to the reader or in Ieblaam (in an unidentified location); the second in the capital; and the third was orchestrated in the safest place of the kingdom — the keep of the royal palace in Samaria. In sum, conspiracies, intrigues, and murders penetrated the whole kingdom; not even the most protected place of the kingdom — the keep of the royal palace — was safe enough to protect the king against conspirators ¹⁸.

A similar effect of increasing instability penetrating the whole kingdom can be observed by analyzing the details concerning the usurper's origin. We know the name of Shallum's father (see below), but no further information about his origin is given. Menahem came from the former royal capital Tirzah, and Pekah was Pekahiah's third man, i.e. the officer of the king's entourage. Thus, an interesting literary dynamic can be observed: from the unknown background of the first usurper, the reader is introduced to a usurper who represented the local aristocracy of Tirzah, and finally the reader discovers the traitor even among the king's entourage.

The narration time, i.e. the length of the narrative dedicated to single *coups d'état*, shows that the instability of the Northern King-

¹⁶ The MT emphasizes the location "Samaria", mentioning it twice: "he came to Samaria", "he struck Shallum, son of Jabesh, in Samaria" (2 Kgs 15,14). This emphasis on Samaria is omitted in Greek manuscripts.

¹⁷ It has been suggested to read the expression **אֶת־אֲרֹנָב וְאֶת־הָאֲרֹנָה** not as two personal names but as the allusion to two protective deities. In this case the intrigues penetrated not only the royal palace, but also the most protected place of the palace; see J.M. GELLER, "New translation for 2 Kings 15:25", *VT* 26 (1976) 374-377. For a short review of other possibilities see COGAN — TADMOR, *II Kings*, 173.

¹⁸ Even though the Greek manuscripts offer slightly different readings, they still preserved a similar dynamic. The *Codex Vaticanus* states that the first *coup d'état* took place in a location undisclosed to the reader, the second took place in Samaria, and the third in front of the royal palace (4 Regn 15,10.14.25). The Antiochian version also preserves similar dynamics, though more similar to that of the MT: the first *coup d'état* took place in Ieblaam, the second in Samaria, and the third in the royal palace (4 Regn 15,10.14.25).

dom tended to increase ¹⁹. Whereas the description of Shallum's conspiracy is very concise (9 words), Menahem's revolt contains more details (13 words) and lastly, the description of Pekah's conspiracy is the longest description of a conspiracy we have in this chapter (19 words). Giving more room to the description of each following insurrection, the problems of Israel can be interpreted as a growing surge of successive uprisings.

Finally, comparing the *coups d'état* of Shallum, Menahem and Pekah with that of Hoshea, we can observe some differences. The *coup d'état* of Hoshea is described in a very concise way similar to that of Shallum. However, it displays some important differences. All revolts and conspiracies are inserted between introductory and concluding regnal résumés ²⁰. These résumés set the outer limits of the event-accounts and enable us to determine the length of the narrative in terms of the number of words and types of motifs used for describing the *coups d'état*. The *coups d'état* are inserted into the reign of the king against whom the *coup d'état* was organized and not into the reign of the king who organized the *coup d'état*. The following table presents four cases from 2 Kings 15:

In the thirty-eighth year of King Azariah of Judah, Zechariah son of Jeroboam reigned over Israel in Samaria six months. He did what was evil in the sight of the LORD, as his ancestors had done. He did not depart from the sins of Jeroboam son of Nebat, which he caused Israel to sin.

Shallum son of Jabesh conspired against him, and struck him down in public and killed him, and reigned in place of him.

Now the rest of the deeds of Zechariah are written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel. (2 Kgs 15,8-11 *NRS*)

Shallum son of Jabesh began to reign in the thirty-ninth year of King Uzziah of Judah; he reigned one month in Samaria.

Then Menahem son of Gadi came up from Tirzah and came to Samaria; he struck down Shallum son of Jabesh in Samaria and killed him; he reigned in place of him.

¹⁹ J.L. SKA, "Our Fathers Have Told Us". Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives (SubBib 13, Roma 1990) 7-8. The notion of narrated and narration time stems from German literary criticism, cf. G. MÜLLER, *Erzählzeit und erzählte Zeit*. Morphologische Poetik. Gesammelte Aufsätze (Hrsg. E. MÜLLER) (Darmstadt 1968) 268-269.

²⁰ B.O. LONG, *2 Kings* (FOTL 10; Grand Rapids, MI 1991) 172.

Now the rest of the deeds of Shallum, including the conspiracy that he made, are written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel. (2 Kgs 15,13-15 *NRS*)

In the fiftieth year of King Azariah of Judah, Pekahiah son of Menahem began to reign over Israel in Samaria; he reigned two years. He did what was evil in the sight of the LORD; he did not turn away from the sins of Jeroboam son of Nebat, which he caused Israel to sin.

Pekah son of Remaliah, his captain, conspired against him with fifty of the Gileadites, and attacked him in Samaria, in the citadel of the palace along with Argob and Arieah; he killed him, and reigned in place of him.

Now the rest of the deeds of Pekahiah, and all that he did, are written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel. (2 Kgs 15,23-26 *NRS*)

In the fifty-second year of King Azariah of Judah, Pekah son of Remaliah began to reign over Israel in Samaria; he reigned twenty years. He did what was evil in the sight of the LORD; he did not depart from the sins of Jeroboam son of Nebat, which he caused Israel to sin.

In the days of King Pekah of Israel, King Tiglath-pileser of Assyria came and captured Ijon, Abel-beth-maacah, Janoah, Kedesh, Hazor, Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali;

and he carried the people captive to Assyria.

Then Hoshea son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah son of Remaliah, attacked him, and killed him; he reigned in place of him, in the twentieth year of Jotham son of Uzziah.

Now the rest of the acts of Pekah, and all that he did, are written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel. (2 Kgs 15,27-31 *NRS*)

This scheme demonstrates that whereas only one event is inserted between the introductory and conclusive regnal résumés of the first three kings ²¹, in the case of Pekah there is the accumulation of three disasters: the Assyrian invasion is followed by the deportation and finishes with a conspiracy. By the accumulation of three events in the reign of one king the biblical texts underline the growing amount of catastrophes befalling the Israelites.

²¹ Also in the case of Menahem only one event – the invasion of Pul – is inserted between the introductory and conclusive regnal résumé (2 Kgs 15,17-22).

In conclusion I pointed out another element leading to the disruption of the Northern kingdom — its gradual deterioration. There was not only one rebellion, but the entire kingdom was caught up in conspiracies and revolts. The intrigues and murders did not spare the king even in the safest place of his kingdom — the keep of the royal palace. Moreover, the corruption of the Northern Kingdom reached such a level that even the king's most trusted people turned out to be murderers. I also argued that by prolonging narration time the final redactors underlined the fact that the uprisings had a tendency to increase. Finally by noting the accumulating disastrous events in Pekah's reign, the reader can observe that while the previous kings had to cope only with one disaster, Pekah had to handle three disasters. This gradual deterioration of the kingdom was another reason that, according to my analysis of 2 Kings 15, ultimately decimated the entire kingdom.

III. Rivalry between the tribes and cities

The above analyses pointed out that the main reasons for the collapse of the Northern Kingdom were its increasing instability and the frequent *coups d'état*. In this section I study some seemingly redundant details that can illuminate the underlying tensions which could have also contributed to the dismantlement of the Northern Kingdom.

The first detail regards Shallum — שָׁלֹם בֶן-יִיֶשׁ (2 Kgs 15,10.13). J. Gray suggested taking the term Jabesh as a geographical name (Jabesh-Gilead)²². If this proposal is accepted, then the conspiracy was based in Transjordan, and Jabesh would be identical with Elijah's place. While Gray's suggestion remains only a helpful hypothesis, verse 15,25 unquestionably attributes an important role in the uprisings to Transjordanian tribes stating that Pekah de-throned Pekahiah with the help of 50 men from Gilead. T. Ishida showed that the rivalry between the Gileadites and the tribes settled west of the Jordan was an important factor in the struggles for the throne in the last decades of the Northern Kingdom²³. Thus, this seemingly redundant detail indicates that one of the reasons for the

²² J. GRAY, *I & II Kings*. A Commentary (London 1970) 621.

²³ T. ISHIDA, *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel*. A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-dynastic Ideology (BZAW 142; Berlin 1977).

Both reports start with a narrative introduction containing *qatal* of the verb בּוֹא and give the name of Assyrian invaders (cf. 2 Kgs 25,1). A series of *wayyiqtol*s following the verb בּוֹא describes how the real power slid out of the hands of the Israelite kings. In the first case Menahem was the subject of two actions: he gave the money to the Assyrian king, and he exacted the money from Israelite nobility. Menahem though facing the Assyrian invasion had still enough power to negotiate the terms of the invader's retreat and even to obtain a desired confirmation of his throne. The second Assyrian invasion is described in a different manner. The protagonist (grammatical subject) of all actions is the Assyrian king; he captured the cities which he wanted, and he deported the people whom he wanted and wherever he wanted. Comparing both invasion reports we can see the differences. In the first case the country is stripped of money; in the second case it is stripped of people. In the first case the country is ravaged by the Israelite king; in the second by the Assyrian king. In the first case the Assyrian king returned to Assyria, but the Israelites stayed in the land; in the second case the Israelites were deported to Assyria ²⁹. In the first invasion Menahem is still an active protagonist able to negotiate with the invaders; in the second case Pekah becomes a passive observer silently witnessing the pillage of his country. The contrast between the two invasion reports points not only to increasing Assyrian power, but also to the gradual loss of executive power of the Israelite kings. During the second invasion the Israelite king had already lost any real power and had to put up with Assyrian whims. A touch of irony can be easily recognized in these verses as well. While Menahem planned to outwit the Assyrian king, in reality this seemingly shrewd political move turned out to be the beginning of the end of the Northern Kingdom.

²⁹ It is important to notice the rhetorical device used for the description of the captured cities: *syndeton* containing seven regions followed by an *asyndeton* mentioning the "entire land of Naphtali". The seven regions mentioned here constitute more than a factual list of captured towns. It should rather be taken as a literary device indicating completeness meaning that the entire north of Israel fell into Tiglath-Pileser's hands.

V. Menahem's reign

The following analysis will focus on the structure of chapter 15. The narrative describes the reign of seven kings — two Judahite kings (Azariah and Jotham) and five Israelite kings (Zechariah, Shallum, Menahem, Pekahiah and Pekah). The reign of these kings is described in quite a stereotyped manner: the description starts with an introductory regnal résumé and ends with a concluding regnal résumé. Chapter 15 thus contains seven literary “bricks”, each separated from the other by regnal résumés. Between the introductory and concluding regnal résumés events important for the reign of a given king (see above) are inserted. This literary technique is not a pattern written in stone, but allows for some variations. Such variations can be found in the cases of Zechariah, Menahem, and Pekah. In the case of Zechariah a formula of prophecy-fulfillment (15,12) is added after the concluding regnal résumé, in the case of Menahem the introductory résumé is prefixed with an *ṭ*-clause (see below), and in the case of Pekah an outline of international relations is inserted in the midst of the concluding regnal résumé (15,37).

Taking into consideration not only the stereotyped repetition of the literary “bricks” as well as the variations from these formulas we can point out that these literary “bricks” are organized in a concentric structure ³⁰.

A Judahite frame: king Azariah (15,1-7)

B Israelite frame: two Israelite kings (Zechariah and Shallum; 15,8-15)

C Center: Menahem's reign (15,16-22)

B' Israelite frame: two Israelite kings (Pekahiah and Pekah; 15,23-31)

A' Judahite frame: king Jotham (15,32-38)

The parallelisms between both sides of the concentric structure can be identified on the lexical and thematic levels. Parts A and A' deal with the Judean kings. Similar positive evaluations can also be found in the evaluation of other kings (1 Kgs 22,43-44; 2 Kgs 12,2-3; 14,3-4; 18,3-4; 22,2), but only in these two cases can we observe word-for-word repetition. The only different word, besides

³⁰ LONG, *2 Kings*, 171.

the proper names, is the verb עָשָׂה in 15,34. Moreover, both kings were touched by God's hand. The Lord struck Azariah with a skin disease and Jotham with the invasions led by Resin and Pekah. Finally, both of them were just kings, but both of them were unable to remove the high places. In sum, the similarities between parts A and A' are important enough to enable us to connect the description of Azariah's reign with that of Jotham.

Parts B and B' also display several similarities. Both describe two Israelite kings. In part B Zechariah was a legitimate successor of Jeroboam and Shallum was a usurper; in B' Pekahiah was a legitimate successor of Menahem and Pekah was a usurper. So the first king in each part is a legitimate successor of his father while the second is a usurper. Moreover, each part contains two formulas denoting a *coup d'état* (see above).

The skillfully built parallelism between parts A–A' and B–B' leads the reader to the narrative center describing Menahem's reign (part C). In order to determine the central part of chapter 15, it is necessary to focus on the addendum³¹ preceding Menahem's reign that lists the brutalities he committed (2 Kgs 15,16). Several scholars have connected this verse with Shallum's reign³². This verse starts with the particle וְ. A similar case starting with an וְ-clause in 1 Kgs 16,21 clearly connects the וְ-clause with what follows and not with what precedes. Moreover, thematically the description regards what follows and not what precedes. Therefore it seems logical that in verse 16 the וְ-clause should be connected with the literary unit describing Menahem's reign, i.e. what follows³³. This clause prefaces the introductory regnal résumé (2 Kgs 15,17) with

³¹ The literary introductory or conclusive regnal résumés could be prefixed, infix or suffixed with addenda. These addenda in 1 and 2 Kings are of two types: the first type adds further information about the king whose death has already been announced (1 Kgs 16,7; 2 Kgs 15,12). The second type serves as a preface to the reign of the king whose reign is going to be described (1 Kgs 16,21).

³² See for example the division in the Catholic Edition of the *Revised Standard Version of the Bible* or M.A. SWEENEY, *I & II Kings. A Commentary* (OTL; London 2007) 372-373.

³³ This verse also functions as a narrative transition between the description of Shallum's (2 Kgs 15,13-15) and Menahem's reign (2 Kgs 15,17-22), in particular by means of repetition of the verb נָכַח in verses 15 and 16. We

a list of Menahem's violent actions. After the digression formed by means of the וַיִּשְׁלַח clause, the description of Menahem's reign follows the stereotyped pattern. The introductory and concluding regnal formulas bracket the most important event which took place during Menahem's reign — the first Assyrian invasion resulting in heavy taxation of the notables of Israel. By placing Menahem's reign in the narrative center of chapter 15 special emphasis is given to his reign and deeds. In this way two characteristics of Menahem's reign are emphasized: his brutality (וַיִּשְׁלַח clause prefacing the introductory regnal résumé) and his negotiation with the Assyrians (event-description bracketed between the introductory and concluding regnal résumés). By means of the concentric structure the ancient scribes focus the reader's attention on three causes latent in Israel that later on led to the collapse of Israel: Menahem's brutalities on the one hand and Assyrian invasions and heavy taxation on the other.

VI. Prefixed addendum: Menahem's brutality

I have argued that 15,16 should be translated: "Then Menahem (started his campaign) from Tirzah and struck Tiphseh, and all who were in it, and all its territories. Indeed he did not (just) breach (it), he struck (it) down — he ripped open all its pregnant women!"³⁴ This translation indicates that Menahem after having seized the throne attempted a campaign against the east. During this campaign he not only captured the city of Tiphseh but also ripped open its pregnant women. The biblical text does not give the reasons for Menahem's cruelties, but rather underlines the arbitrariness of Menahem's action. Menahem's violence did not stop at "regular" war cruelties (e.g. to breach a city), but he exterminated life-bearers (pregnant women) and life in its prenatal form (fetuses). This kind of violence is rarely attested in the extra-biblical source and always presents an extreme case³⁵.

can therefore conclude that from the structural point of view verse 16 is connected to the literary unit describing Menahem's reign; from the narrative point of view the verse serves as a transition from Shallum's to Menahem's reign.

³⁴ DUBOVSKÝ, "Menahem's Reign", 41.

³⁵ M. COGAN, "'Ripping open Pregnant Women' in Light of an Assyrian Analogue", *JAOS* 103 (1983) 755-757; P. DUBOVSKÝ, "Ripping Open Preg-

I suggest that the fact that Menahem's cruelty is at the center of the narrative provides another reason for the interpretation of the collapse of the Northern Kingdom. The usurper Menahem did not hesitate, during his military expansion, to use the cruellest atrocity ever committed during military campaigns. The king who was to guarantee order and justice is now promoting savage ferocity and barbarity. Naturally the brutality and cruelty of the usurpers disrupted the moral pillars upon which the Northern Kingdom rested. Seeing these atrocities in terms of retributive justice (Exod 21,22-25), we can understand Hosea's prophecy against Samaria (Hos 14,1): "Samaria will be held guilty, for she has rebelled against her God. They will fall by the sword, their little ones will be dashed in pieces, and their pregnant women will be ripped open" (NAS).

VII. Hyperbolic numbers: financial and economic drain

The account of Menahem's reign is embedded between two regional résumés and states that the king had to pay the Assyrians 1,000 talents of silver in order to save his throne (2 Kgs 15,19-20). H. Tadmor's study on Menahem's payment demonstrates that such a large sum was usually paid by a usurper to Assyria so that Assyria would confirm his claim to the throne³⁶. However, it makes sense to ask: what is the symbolic meaning of this payment? In other words, why did the biblical writers mention this large sum of money and place it at the center of 2 Kings 15? One way of understanding the symbolic value of this sum of money is to convert 1,000 talents of silver into commodities which could have been acquired for this sum of money³⁷. Naturally this does not mean con-

nant Arab Women: Reliefs in Room L of Ashurbanipal's North Palace", *Or* 78 (2009) 394-419.

³⁶ H. TADMOR, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria*. Critical Edition, with Introductions, Translations and Commentary (Jerusalem 1994) 276.

³⁷ This estimate is based on several studies which provide the basis for conversion rates: 1 talent = 60 minas = 3,600 shekels; 1 shekel of gold = 15 shekels of silver; 200 cors of grain = 0.166 shekels of silver; 1 daric = 0.737 shekel; see *EJ* 20, 703-708; *ABD* I, 1078; F.B. BARAHONA, "Sistema hebreo de pesos", *Aula Orientalis* 28 (2010) 25-37, P.J. KING – L.E. STAGER, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Louisville, KY 2001) 199.

verting a sum following the rates of the stock market of that time, but converting it on the basis of the rates a reader could acquire by reading the Bible. One thousand talents of silver equals 3,600,000 shekels of silver. According to 1 Kgs 10,29 one chariot cost 600 shekels and one warhorse 500 shekels. Consequently for the reader of 1–2 Kings this would mean that Assyria could buy 50,000 chariots ³⁸ or 60,000 horses. If we take into consideration the fact that Solomon in his glory had only 1,400 chariots (1 Kgs 10,26) and 12,000 horses, then 50,000 chariots or 60,000 horses possibly bought for 1,000 talents of silver would represent an army much superior to that of Solomon.

If this sum of money is translated into terms of real estate, then Menahem gave to the Assyrians a financial capital that would enable them to buy almost the entire land of Israel, its cattle, sheep, and goats ³⁹. If this sum is translated into terms of human beings, then with this money the Assyrian king could acquire a good number of Israelites ⁴⁰. In sum, by giving this money to the Assyrians Menahem enabled the Assyrian king to acquire almost the whole of Israel and its inhabitants.

The second number mentioned in 2 Kgs 15,19-20 regards the details describing how Menahem collected this huge amount of money: he took this money from his nobles; each person had to pay 50 shekels. Since the final sum was 3,600,000 shekels and every noble of Israel had to pay 50 shekels, it would require taxing 72,000 people. This would practically mean taxing all the nobles of Israel. In addition 50 shekels has also a theological meaning. It was the value which according to Lev 27,3 an adult had had to pay to God/temple. In consequence, Menahem made each noble pay the Assyrian king the price which an individual was to pay to God.

Even though the numbers mentioned above cannot be taken at their face-value, by mentioning this huge sum other causes leading to the collapse of the Northern Kingdom can be pointed out. Mena-

³⁸ According to 1 Chr 19,6 Assyria could obtain “only” 32,000 chariots.

³⁹ 1,000 talents of silver would be an equivalent of 7,500 Abraham’s burial places (Gen 23,13-14), 500 Shemer’s estates (1 Kgs 16,24) or 42,857 Jeremiah’s estates (Jer 32,9). For equivalents see also *ABD* VI, 1119.

⁴⁰ According to Leviticus 27 the Assyrians received the money equivalent of 30,000 virgins, 60,000 free men, 100,000 free women, 150,000 boys, 300,000 girls, or 100,000 slaves (Exod 21,32).

hem's payment and other tributes must have drained the wealth of Israel, broken the economic power of Israel, and financially ruined the Northern Kingdom ⁴¹. Menahem is thus portrayed as the opposite of Solomon. The money flowed into Israel under Solomon, but under Menahem money flowed out of Israel ⁴². Moreover, drawing on the wallets of 72,000 nobles must have severely undermined Menahem's popularity. Ironically by receiving this money, the Assyrians were able to form an army which then could easily attack Samaria and later on become the basis of Rab-Shakeh's boasting (2 Kgs 18,19-26).

VIII. Israel's wrong international policy

The deterioration of the Northern Kingdom is fitted into the narrative about two Judahite kings — Azariah and Jotham, which creates the narrative frame for the central part of chapter 15 (see above). By analyzing this narrative frame we can point out another cause of the downfall of the Northern Kingdom encoded in the rhetoric of 2 Kings 15 — its wrong international policy.

The narrative frame constituted by the accounts of two Judean kings is characterized above all by solidity. In contrast to five Israelite kings who reigned for a total of 32 years and 6 months, the Southern Kingdom is characterized by dynastic stability: two Judean kings reigned for a total of 68 years. No conspiracy or revolt took place during the reigns of Azariah and Jotham, whereas four *coups d'état* took place during the reign of five Israelite kings. Another element of stability can be derived from an assessment of both kings: they did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, marred in both cases only by a less-than-full approval by God, whereas all five Israelite kings did what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord ⁴³. Thus, the image of serenity and of a long-lasting Davidic dynasty, even though facing its own problems, constitutes the essential fea-

⁴¹ If these conclusions are combined with 2 Kgs 17,4, then the reader learns that besides this huge payment the Israelites had to pay annual tributes to the Assyrians.

⁴² W. BRUEGGEMANN, *1 & 2 Kings* (Macon, GA 2000) 455.

⁴³ LONG, *2 Kings*, 172.

ture of this narrative frame. Consequently the problem of the Northern Kingdom is defined in terms of its relations to Judah.

In the first part of the frame the relations between Judah and Israel are not mentioned ⁴⁴. At the end of the chapter Israel allied with Aram and started attacking Judah. This split between the two kingdoms developed into a fully-fledged armed conflict described in 2 Kings 16 and Isaiah 7. Thus another latent element responsible for the collapse of the Northern Kingdom can be discerned: Pekah deliberately broke off the natural connections with Judah and formed a coalition with Israel's former enemy — Aram. This shift of international relations triggered an avalanche: in the course of less than twenty years Israel broke off and re-established contacts with Assyria, Aram, and Egypt.

The rupture between Israel and Judah incorporated into the narrative frame of chapter 15 suggests that Israel's breaking-off its kindred-based relations with Judah, which constituted a solid "frame" for Israel's international relations, went hand-in-hand with forming a series of senseless coalitions, ironically all of them concluded with their former or current enemies (Assyria, Aram, Egypt). It can therefore be concluded that the breaking-off with Judah and the shifting allegiances led to the gradual disintegration of Israelite international relations.

IX. Why did Samaria fall according to 2 Kings 15?

Let us now sum up the previous results. Without any doubt the Assyrian invasions were the main cause of the fall of the Northern Kingdom that resulted in the transformation of the independent kingdom into the Assyrian province *Sāmirīna* that was repopulated by the nations deported from other parts of the Neo-Assyrian Empire ⁴⁵. However, according to 2 Kings 15 the Assyrian campaigns were only one among many other reasons that caused the downfall of the Northern Kingdom. The analyses presented above suggest

⁴⁴ It may be that there was some mutual co-operation between Azariah and Zechariah; see M. HARAN, "The Rise and Decline of the Empire of Jeroboam ben Joash", *VT* 17 (1967) 266-297.

⁴⁵ N. NA'AMAN – R. ZADOK, "Assyrian Deportations to the Province of Samerina in the Light of Two Cuneiform Tablets from Tel Hadid", *TA* 27 (2000) 159-188.

that there was no one primary reason why the Northern Kingdom fell but rather a series of elements whose combination ultimately led to the downfall of Israel. I will divide the reasons for the fall of the Northern Kingdom into seven categories ⁴⁶:

(1) The analysis of the fixed formula *coup d'état*, indicated that the Northern Kingdom during its last years reached the peak of its political instability and that a kingdom torn by seven (the full number of *coups d'état*) could not last too long.

(2) The analysis of additions to the fixed formula brought similar results: the unstable kingdom became unsafe. The conspiracies penetrated the whole kingdom and reached even the supposedly safest place in the kingdom – the royal keep. The rebels and conspirers penetrated all social strata: they were among commoners, among local aristocracy as well as among the king's most trusted men. The conspiracies were not just a series of mishaps but the social structure and the entire land became infected ⁴⁷. Finally, the analysis of narration time and the combination of events attributed to four northern kings showed that instability had a tendency to increase.

(3) The analysis of seemingly redundant details pointed to the tensions underlying the conspiracies and revolts. The kingdom was torn into pieces by tensions between the tribes settled on both sides of Jordan as well as by tensions between Samaria and Tirzah, the new and old capitals of Israel.

(4) The analysis of heroes in the description of Assyrian invasions brought up another dynamic that led to the fall of the Northern Kingdom: gradual loss of executive power. Whereas Menahem was still able to negotiate with Assyria, Pekah became a passive witness of Assyrian looting.

While identifying the narrative center of the passage I proposed two other causes of the collapse of the Northern Kingdom: Menahem's brutality and the drain on finances.

⁴⁶ The number seven is evidently an approximate number and one could add other causes not mentioned in this analysis or form different groups of causes. The choice of "seven" hints at the symbolic value of this number – the completeness of causes.

⁴⁷ According to Num 35,33-34, violent bloodshed, often connected with *coups d'état*, pollutes the land in such a way that no expiation can be made for it. When this infection of the land 'reaches the level that God's holiness can no longer tolerate, God forsakes his people and his land, withdrawing his protection and care', see B. HROBŇ, *Ethical Dimension of Cult in the Book of Isaiah* (BZAW 418; Berlin – New York 2010) 54.

(5) Menahem committed atrocities that no just king had ever committed. Consequently the kingdom ruled by a king who did not hesitate to rip open pregnant women was condemned according to Hos 14,1 to be punished by the same token.

(6) The analysis of the hyperbolic sum of money paid to Pul contains a good dose of irony. The payment not only drained Israel of money but also gave the Assyrians the financial means to build up an army that they used to conquer Samaria a few years later.

(7) The analysis of the narrative frame displayed the problems of Israelite international politics. After a period of peaceful relations between Israel and Judah, Israel broke off relations with Judah and concluded a series of senseless alliances with their neighbors. Naturally these new alliances did not last too long and turned out to be counterproductive.

X. Biblical rhetoric in its ANE context

The expansion of the Assyrian Empire is marked by the victorious campaigns that resulted in the annexation of entire regions to the Assyrian administrative orbit ⁴⁸. Indeed, the image of Assyrian troops marching through the Levant conquering one city after the other can be easily drawn from Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. This image, however, should be nuanced by more recent studies. B.J. Parker has suggested that it is more appropriate to use a network model for understanding the Neo-Assyrian Empire. The Empire, according to Parker, was not “a spread of land but a network of transportation and communication corridors, [...] large components of the Neo-Assyrian provincial system were physically separated from the rest of the empire by vast expanses of territory that were not subject to direct imperial control” ⁴⁹. Moreover A. Fuchs analyzing Assyrian victories has shown that the Assyrian army was not as irresistible as it is portrayed in the royal inscriptions. The Assyrians had to recur to various, often non-military tools to conquer well-fortified cities ⁵⁰. These two studies point out, as does the

⁴⁸ N. NA'AMAN, “Province System and Settlement Patterns in Southern Syria and Palestine in the Neo-Assyrian Period”, *Neo-Assyrian Geography* (ed. M. LIVERANI) (Roma 1995) 103-115; K. RADNER, “Provinz”, *RIA* 11, 43.

⁴⁹ B.J. PARKER, *The Mechanics of Empire*. The Northern Frontier of Assyria as a Case Study in Imperial Dynamics (Helsinki 2001) 256.

⁵⁰ A. FUCHS, “Über den Wert von Befestigungsanlagen”, *ZA* 98 (2008) 45-99.

analysis of 2 Kings 15, that the Assyrian campaigns were only one reason among many others responsible for the Assyrian victories. The fall of Samaria was not an exception. The following examples illustrate similarities between Assyrian military and non-military tools and the dynamics found in 2 Kings 15.

The reconstruction of Ashurbanipal's conquest of Elam showed that the Assyrian campaigns on their own were unable to eradicate Elamite resistance. There were several other dynamics that, combined with the military campaigns, ultimately brought victory for Assyria. Let us name some of them. First, the Assyrians willingly interfered with Elamite internal politics by fomenting its political instability and by raids organized by Assyrian officials stationed on the Elamite border. As the result of this policy there were five *coups d'état* within two decades. Second, the disagreements among the Elamite leading groups, being divided into three major factions, resulted in frequently changing allegiances, rebellions, and even executions of opponents. Finally, the instability was even more aggravated by famine. This study on the end of Elamite period II revealed three major dynamics in play: the Assyrian royal campaigns, the subversive activities of Assyrian officials left in the region after the retreat of the royal troops, and the internal instability and tensions in Elam ⁵¹. Similar dynamics have been reconstructed in the case of the Assyrian conquest of Egypt. Several *coups d'état* took place in Egypt before Ashurbanipal finally incorporated Egypt into the Assyrian Empire ⁵². These two examples, which could be easily multiplied, suffice to demonstrate that the Assyrians fostered tensions in a given region, using all available tools since it is always much easier to control or to conquer a kingdom that is internally divided. These dynamics, however, were not exclusive to the Assyrian period. M. Giorgieri has analyzed the forms of rule and the political struggles in the Hittite Kingdom just before it collapsed and pointed out that similar dynamics were in play in the Hittite

⁵¹ P. DUBOVSKÝ, "Dynamics of the Fall: Ashurbanipal's Conquest of Elam", *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives. Proceedings of the International Congress Held at Ghent University, December 14-17, 2009* (eds. K.D. GRAEF – J. TAVERNIER) (Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse 58; Leiden – Boston, MA 2013) 462-463.

⁵² D.E. KAHN, "The Assyrian Invasions of Egypt (673-663 B.C.) and the Final Expulsion of the Kushites", *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 34 (2006) 251-267.

Kingdom as well. In particular he listed the struggle over sovereignty that caused some noble families to take sides with one faction or another, the elimination of opponents, a request for total loyalty and death threats in the case of defection or betrayal, concession of privileges, and finally famines and demographic crises ⁵³.

Another reason for instability of a given region was heavy taxation. K. Radner has listed various types of taxes and tributes the Assyrians imposed upon their subordinates or partners ⁵⁴. Heavy tributes, on the one hand, brought in capital to Assyria, and, on the other hand, they drained a given region and usually triggered rebellions and *coups d'état*. An illustrative example is the rebellion of the Arabs. The continuous increase in taxes brought the Arabs to desperation and then to rebellion against Assyria. The rebellion was considered a transgression (sin) and was violently suppressed by Esarhaddon (RINAP 4 1 iv 1-31).

These examples illustrate that some dynamics decoded in the rhetoric of 2 Kings 15 were tools that the Assyrians often employed to buttress their military campaigns. In particular, the Assyrians willingly supported political factions and fomented the instability of a given region. Naturally, similar dynamics were not invented by the Assyrians, but also occurred in other periods and regions.

* *

*

The annalistic passages of the Bible, such as 2 Kings 15, have been studied mainly for the purpose of the reconstruction of political history of a given period. In this paper I have tried to demonstrate that such kind of passages convey not only a description of the events that can be more or less reliable, but also an interpretation of

⁵³ M. GIORGIERI, "Kingship in Hatti during the 13th Century: Forms of Rule and Struggles for Power before the Fall of the Empire", *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer* (eds. Y. COHEN – A. GILAN) (Wiesbaden 2010) 136-157.

⁵⁴ K. RADNER, "Abgaben an den König von Assyrien aus dem In- und Ausland", *Geschenke und Steuern, Zölle und Tribute. Antike Abgabenformen in Anspruch und Wirklichkeit* (eds. H. KLINKOTT – S. KUBISCH) (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 29; Leiden – Boston, MA 2007) 213-230.

the events encoded in the rhetoric of redactors and final editors. 2 Kings 15 is a good example of how an apparently monotonous description of events, in particular, revolts, invasions, and rebellions, could point to some dynamics that can easily escape the reader's attention. Even though 2 Kings 15 is the result of multiple redactors and editors, its final composition points to a well conceived structure that goes beyond a mere description of political events. By examining 2 Kings 15 I have pointed out structural and rhetorical elements that could lead us to a new reconstruction of the fall of the Northern Kingdom. In particular, by analyzing various narrative and rhetorical devices I have suggested that the fall of the Northern Kingdom was due to the combination of multiple external and internal factors. This conclusion achieved from the rhetoric of the biblical texts corroborates several studies on the mechanics of the Neo-Assyrian expansion and control. These studies show that Assyrian military campaigns on their own were often insufficient to subdue hostile kingdoms and had to be supported by other military and non-military tools such as fomenting instability in the region, financial pressure, covert actions, raids, etc. Combining these two types of studies we can conclude that the fall of the Northern Kingdom was caused by multiple factors listed in section VII.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Rome

Peter DUBOVSKÝ

SUMMARY

By applying various exegetical methodologies to 2 Kings 15, I have tried to identify the dynamics responsible for the fall of the Northern Kingdom, such as its instability, financial problems, tribal tensions, wrong international policy, etc. By analyzing some Assyrian documents it was shown that these dynamics were often in play during Assyrian invasions.

Does Eliphaz Really Begin “Gently”? An Intertextual Reading of Job 4,2-11

I. The Problem: does Eliphaz initially praise or rebuke Job?

Many modern interpreters are of the opinion that Eliphaz affirms Job's righteousness in his first speech in Job 4-5, and only later accuses him of wrongdoing. Commentators cite his opening words in 4,2-6, in particular, as evidence that Eliphaz is praising Job's good deeds in an effort to offer him support and reassurance in his time of suffering. Terrien, for example, remarks that Eliphaz “begins considerably, and proceeds with notable gentleness and courtesy”, while Pope writes that he “appears to concede that Job's piety and conduct have been exemplary”¹.

It is difficult, however, to reconcile this positive reading with some of the other verses in Eliphaz's speech. His emphasis on the fate of the wicked in 4,8-11, for example, would be peculiar if he believed Job to be guiltless; in some of the older commentaries (e.g., those of Duhm, Peake, Strahan, Ball), in fact, this presumed shift in tone has led scholars to go so far as to delete vv. 8-11 in whole or in part and/or to propose that they are later interpolations². Among more recent interpreters, Terrien, Driver-Gray, Clines, Newsom, and many others have noted the inappropriateness or clumsiness of various statements in 4,7-11 if Eliphaz's aim is to comfort Job³. That Eliphaz

¹ S. TERRIEN, “The Book of Job: Introduction and Exegesis”, *The Interpreter's Bible* 3 (1954) 877-1198, here 932; M. POPE, *Job* (Garden City, NY 1973) 36. For a very different assessment of Eliphaz's intent, one that interprets Eliphaz's words here as an accusation rather than an attempt to comfort Job, see M. BUTTENWIESER, *The Book of Job* (New York 1922) 161.

² D.B. DUHM, *Das Buch Hiob* (Freiburg 1897) 26-27; A.S. PEAKE, *Job*. Introduction, Revised Version with Notes and Index (New York 1905) 79; J. STRAHAN, *The Book of Job Interpreted* (Edinburgh 1913) 61; C.J. BALL, *The Book of Job, a Revised Text and Version* (Oxford 1922) 134-135.

³ S. TERRIEN, “Job”, 935-938; S.R. DRIVER – G.B. GRAY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (ICC; Edinburgh 1921) 43; D.J.A. CLINES, *Job 1-20* (WBC 17; Dallas, TX 1989) 126-127; C. NEWSOM, “Job”, *The New Interpreter's Bible* IV (1996) 317-637, here 377.

would maintain Job's righteousness here also appears to contradict the sense of 5,17, where he urges Job not to "reject the discipline of the Almighty"; if he believes Job to be sinless, for what is he being disciplined? Further, it is worth noting that Job himself does not appear to take kindly to Eliphaz's words, as his harsh response in 6,14-18 indicates. Finally, such a positive assessment of Eliphaz's intent is also inconsistent with the sharp tone of the rest of the speeches of the "friends", including Eliphaz's own subsequent offerings in chapters 15 and 22. Only in 4,2-6 — at least as these verses are conventionally interpreted — do Eliphaz's words seem inconsistent with the idea that he believes Job's suffering to be the result of sin.

II. An alternative interpretation: Job 4,2-11 as Eliphaz's intertextual critique of Job

There is, however, another interpretation of this passage that brings its tone into agreement with the "friends'" other, more accusatory speeches. Eliphaz's words here exhibit a strong semantic parallelism with terms in the final part of Job's speech in 3,20-26, in which Job asks why God gives life to those who suffer⁴. I propose that 4,2-6 are best viewed as Eliphaz's intertextual "response" to Job's tacit indictment of God in 3,20-26, and that what at first glance might appear to be concern and encouragement on Eliphaz's part is in fact a sharp rebuke to Job for his complaints about his "fear" and his inability to find "rest". According to this reading, Eliphaz's message — and indeed that of the "friends" in all subsequent chapters — is consistent throughout: he believes Job must have sinned to be suffering so. In what follows, I will discuss 4,2-11 in order, paying particular attention to 4,2 and 4,6, the verses most often cited as evidence that Eliphaz is sympathetic and reassuring to Job at this point in the dialogue. I will use the *NASB* translation to convey an idea of the traditional interpretation of these

⁴ For a discussion of the semantic links between Job 3 & 4-5 (and 6-7), see W.A.M. BEUKEN, "Job's Imprecation as the Cradle of a New Religious Discourse: The Perplexing Impact of the Semantic Correspondences between Job 3, Job 4-5, and Job 6-7", *The Book of Job* (ed. W.A.M. BEUKEN) (Leuven 1994) 41-78.

verses, and offer my own rendering (where it differs) in the comments that follow.

III. A close reading of Job 4,2

4,2 If one ventures a word with you, will you become impatient?
But who can refrain from speaking?

Eliphaz's first words are generally viewed as a gentle expression of sympathy for his suffering friend. But this is based entirely on the presumed sense of the first colon, since the second — “But who can refrain from speaking?” — sounds more like an expression of indignation (i.e. at the provocation of Job's words in chapter 3) than one of sympathy. It is thus the second verb in the first colon, תִּלְאָה, that is the key to viewing the verse as an expression of concern. The standard lexica gloss the *qal* verb of לָאָה as “be weary, impatient” or similarly; the root occurs frequently in the *nip'al* (“be weary, make oneself weary”, e.g., Exod 7,18; Isa 1,14; Jer 9,4) and *hip'il* (“make weary, exhaust”, e.g., Isa 7,13; Jer 12,5; Mic 6,3), but apart from this passage (see also 4,5), the *qal* is attested only in Gen 19,11, where it appears to have the first, more physical meaning of “weary” rather than “impatient”⁵. Commentators who take it as an indicator of Eliphaz's sympathy, however, see תִּלְאָה as a reference to an emotional state: in addition to the *NASB*'s “become impatient”, translations such as “offended”, “grieved”, “dejected”, and “irritated” have been offered, with the assumption being that Eliphaz is reluctant to speak for fear of upsetting his friend, but nevertheless decides to do so in order to comfort him.

But is the Joban poet really trying to portray Eliphaz as worried about causing Job emotional distress? Though most modern exegetes are of this opinion, there is a variety of views expressed in the ancient Versions and among the traditional authorities. Rashi, for example, interprets תִּלְאָה as a reference to physical exhaustion

⁵ The Ugaritic cognate *l'y* (cf. *KTU* 1.100:68) is glossed as “to tire” (L. KOEHLER – W. BAUMGARTNER, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* [Leiden 2000] 512) or “be/become weak” (P. BORDREUIL – D. PARDEE, *A Manual of Ugaritic* [Winona Lake, IN 2009] 328), cf. Akkadian *la'ū*. In rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic לָא means “to labor” or “to be tired”.

rather than irritation or impatience ⁶, while the Targum and Peshitta simply utilize the Aramaic and Syriac cognates in their translations, תשחלהי ("be tired") and גלגל ("wearied by labor") ⁷. Further, as a number of scholars have pointed out, the interrogative ה modifies the verb to which it is attached, נסה, rather than תלאה. The translators of the Septuagint and Targum recognized this: though they render the verse quite differently, neither presents תלאה as the focus of Eliphaz's question. The verb describing Job's distress is thus better read as an acknowledgement of Job's current condition, rather than what may happen if Eliphaz speaks.

If תלאה is therefore read as "you are weary", "you are exhausted" or similarly, then Eliphaz's first words create a strong distant semantic parallelism with 3,26, where Job laments his inability to find "ease" or "rest" ⁸. The perception of parallelism is further strengthened by Eliphaz's use of דבר ("word") and מלין ("words") in 4,2, given that Job also complains of his lack of שקט ("quiet") in 3,26. The sense of 4,2a would then be "May one try a word with you, since you are so exhausted?" ⁹ This sharp tone matches that of the next colon: "But who can hold back words?" When viewed in this way, Eliphaz's first words are in fact an intertextual "response" to Job's last: he is not expressing his concern that he might "offend" Job, but rather asserting that he is compelled to speak despite Job's previous complaint that he has no "ease", "silence", or "rest". These are not the words of a comforting friend, but rather one who is indignant at what he has heard and feels compelled to answer.

⁶ Mikra'ot Gedolot Sefer Iyov (Jerusalem 1998) 13-14.

⁷ CLINES (*Job 1-20*, 108) writes that לאה indicates a lack of ability, and so is the opposite of יכל in the next colon. Also see C.L. SEOW, *Job 1-21*. Interpretation and Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI 2013) 392. I concur with this reading of the sense, but given the usage elsewhere within the Bible and without (see n. 5 above), this inability is in my view best read as being due to exhaustion or weariness, not a lack of capability.

⁸ "Distant" semantic parallelism, using the nomenclature of the system of analysis designed by Dennis Pardee, refers to parallel elements separated from each other by at least one other poetic unit; see D. PARDEE, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism*. A Trial Cut ('nt I and Proverbs 2) (Leiden – New York 1988) 187-191. In this case, the verses are separated only by the introductory formula in 4,1.

⁹ Cf. DHORME, *Le livre de Job*, 38.

IV. Analysis of Job 4,3-5

4,3-5 are also better viewed as a critique of Job, instead of encouragement as is so often supposed:

- 4,3 Behold you have admonished many,
And you have strengthened weak hands.
4,4 Your words have helped the tottering to stand,
And you have strengthened feeble knees.
4,5 But now it has come to you, and you are impatient;
It touches you, and you are dismayed.

Many modern exegetes assume that Eliphaz is praising Job here. Andersen, for example, writes that his words represent “a pleasing tribute to Job’s reputation, especially his ability to help others in their difficulties”¹⁰. As a result of this assumption, the verb יִסְרֶה in v. 3 is often translated as “you have encouraged”, “you have counseled”, or similarly. But there is an ambiguity to Eliphaz’s words that allows for another interpretation. In his article on the use of equivocal words in Eliphaz’s speech, Hoffman writes:

If Eliphaz is saying that Job used to strengthen suffering people, then he actually praises and encourages Job ... On the other hand, if *ysr* is interpreted here as chastisement, then Eliphaz blames Job for hypocrisy: you dared to chastise other people, but now, when you share their misfortune, you blaspheme God! Since this ambiguity is placed at the beginning, it can determine the nature of the entire exhortation¹¹.

This more critical sense of יִסַּר, in fact, was perceived by the translators of the ancient versions: the Targum renders יִסְרֶה here as כִּסְנָהא (“rebuke, chastise”), the Septuagint as ἐνουθέτησας (“put in mind, admonish, warn, advise”), the Peshiṭta as ܐܝܬܝܢܐ (“instruct, chastise”)

¹⁰ F.I. ANDERSEN, *Job. An Introduction and Commentary* (TOTC 13; Leicester 1976) 111.

¹¹ See Y. HOFFMAN, “The Use of Equivocal Words in the First Speech of Eliphaz (Job IV-V)”, *VT* 30 (1980) 114-119, here 114. Fullerton also noted the Joban poet’s use of ambiguous language; see K. FULLERTON, “Double Entendre in the First Speech of Eliphaz”, *JBL* 49 (1930) 320-374.

and the Vulgate as *docuisti* ("teach, tell, show"). Rabbinic authorities such as Rashi and Ralbag also viewed Eliphaz as rebuking Job here ¹².

An intertextual reading of the next three cola also indicates that Eliphaz is not encouraging Job, but rather setting up an accusation of double standards in 4,5. Just as 4,2 was a response to Job's complaint of a lack of "rest" in 3,26, so 4,3-4 can be viewed as an intertextual response to Job's expression of "fear" and "dread" in 3,25 ("For what I fear comes upon me, and what I dread befalls me"). The metaphors of "feeble hands" and "weak knees", though generally taken to be Eliphaz's praise of Job for his past support of the despondent and unfortunate, are used elsewhere in the biblical corpus to describe symptoms of "fear" or "anxiety", frequently the terror felt by those who have experienced God's wrath ¹³. Similarly, forms of כָּשַׁל ("stumble") from 4,4a are often used in prophetic literature as a metaphor for sinners facing divine punishment ¹⁴. The fact that Eliphaz uses imagery associated with the fear of divine judgment suggests that he is citing Job's past attitude to those being punished by God, rather than cataloging his general kindness and piety. Since Eliphaz goes on to state, "But now it has come to you [...]" in the next verse, the implication is clear: he views Job's suffering as divine punishment.

Even those who believe that Eliphaz affirms Job's righteousness in his opening speech often acknowledge that 4,5 exhibits a sharp tone. Strahan, for example, writes that in this verse Eliphaz "very distinctly strikes the wrong notes of blame and reproof" ¹⁵. But this verse's accusatory tone is not a "wrong note" in an otherwise sympathetic discourse if Eliphaz's intention from the very beginning is to critique Job, rather than to praise him. If 4,2 is a response to the idea of "exhaustion" in 3,26, and 4,3-4 to Job's expression of "fear" and "dread" in 3,25, then 4,5 has semantic links to both of these themes: Eliphaz cites Job's "exhaustion" — again using a form of

¹² *Mikra'ot Gedolot Sefer Iyov*, 14-16.

¹³ For "weak hands" and/or "feeble knees" as metaphors for fear, cf. e.g., 2 Sam 4,1; Ezra 4,4; Neh 6,9; Isa 13,7; 35,3; Jer 6,24; 38,4; 47,3; 50,43; Ezek 7,17; 21,7; Zeph 3,16. The phrase "strengthen weak hands" is used to indicate an exhortation to courage; e.g., 1 Sam 23,16; Ezra 6,22; Isa 41,13; Ezek 13,22.

¹⁴ Cf. Isa 3,8; 8,15; 28,13; 59,14; Jer 6,15.21; 8,12; 18,23; 20,11; 46,6.16; Hos 4,5; 5,5; 14,1.9; Lam 1,14.

¹⁵ STRAHAN, *The Book of Job Interpreted*, 60-61.

לֹאֵה — with the first colon, and his “fear” (the *nip‘al* of בָּהֵל, “be dismayed, terrified”) with the second ¹⁶. His phrasing, as has been noted by a number of commentators, suggests that he is accusing Job of not “practicing what he has preached”: Job has previously presumed to offer moral instruction to those being chastened by God, and urged them to take courage in the face of adversity. Now, however, he fails to heed his own advice and correct his behavior, and instead gives vent to his distress in what Eliphaz views as an unseemly or even blasphemous manner.

V. Job 4,6a: is Eliphaz comforting or criticizing Job?

The reference to Job’s “terror” in 4,5 creates an excellent semantic parallel with “your fear” (יִרְאָתְךָ) in 4,6, which is the key verse in determining Eliphaz’s attitude toward Job. As such, it will be discussed in detail. The Hebrew text (with the *NASB*’s translation) reads:

4,6 Is not your fear of God your confidence,
And the integrity of your ways your hope?

The majority of modern commentators view this verse as Eliphaz’s acknowledgement of Job’s piety and righteousness. Newsom, for example, notes that Eliphaz’s words here echo the positive assessment of Job offered by both the narrator and God in the Prologue (1,1; 1,8; 2,3); she writes that they “make clear that Eliphaz does not assume Job is sinful” ¹⁷. The meaning of the terms in the second colon — תְּקִוְתְּךָ, “your hope” and תִּמְ דְּרִכֶּיךָ, “the integrity of your ways” — seems clear. The position of the *waw*-conjunction is peculiar, however, and thus complicates the relationship to the first colon (see discussion below).

¹⁶ Though some translations (e.g., *KJV*, *ASV*) render תְּבִהֵל here as “troubled”, in modern English usage this might lack the idea of “fright” connoted by the verb. The four other occurrences of forms of בָּהֵל in Job (21,6; 22,10; 23,15.16) are all in parallelism with “fear” terminology.

¹⁷ C. NEWSOM, “Job”, 376; see also CLINES, *Job 1–20*, 109, 123–124; S. BALENTINE, *Job* (Smyth and Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon, GA 2006) 105–106, and many others.

The interpretation of the terms in 4,6a is more difficult. **יִרְאָה** literally means “fear”, although here most modern scholars read it as an ellipsis for **יִרְאָה אֱלֹהִים** (“fear of God”, i.e. “reverence” or “piety”) based on an assumed parallelism with **תָּם דְּרִכֶּיךָ** in the second colon. **כְּסֻלְתְּךָ** is then rendered as “your confidence”, “your assurance”, or similarly, assuming parallelism with **תְּקוּתֶךָ** in 4,6b, and the verse as a whole is taken as Eliphaz’s expression of admiration for Job’s excellent moral character, and of his belief that Job should be comforted by recalling it.

As a number of interpreters have noted, however, the ambiguity of both **יִרְאָה** and **כְּסֻלְתְּךָ** means that the verse can be read in multiple ways, leading to very different assessments of Eliphaz’s intent¹⁸. Wolfers, Seow, and others have pointed out that **יִרְאָה** does not typically mean “reverence” unless it is placed in construct with a name for God (e.g., **יִרְאָה שְׁדֵי** in Job 6,14; **יִרְאָה אֲדֹנִי** in Job 28,28) or a pronominal suffix referring to God¹⁹.

The meaning of the other term in 4,6a, the rare **כְּסֻלָּה** (which occurs elsewhere only in Ps 85,9), has also been the subject of debate. The segholate noun **כְּסֻל** is believed to have one of two meanings when used metaphorically: either “confidence” or “folly” (cf. **כְּסִיל**, “stupid fellow, fool”). If the meaning of **כְּסֻלָּה** is similar to one of those of **כְּסֻל** (as is often supposed), then the tone of 4,6 depends on which of these two senses is intended. If it is “confidence,” then Eliphaz is reassuring Job. If, on the other hand, **כְּסֻלָּה** means “folly,” then Eliphaz is chastising Job, irrespective of whether **יִרְאָה** is interpreted as “fear” or “reverence”. As Beuken writes, “[t]he

¹⁸ See Y. HOFFMAN, “Equivocal Words”, 115. Also N. HABEL, *The Book of Job. A Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA 1985) 124; BEUKEN, “Job’s Imprecation”, 58-59, and a number of others.

¹⁹ D. WOLFERS, *Deep Things Out of Darkness. The Book of Job. Essays and a New English Translation* (Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 379. Also see Seow’s concise remarks (SEOW, *Job 1–21*, 395). Though Strahan, Rowley, and several others have cited the Joban poet’s use of **יִרְאָה** in 15,4 and 22,4 as evidence that the term by itself can refer to “reverence”, neither passage requires this interpretation; “fear” works equally well in both cases. In 15,4, Eliphaz could be saying that Job is no longer fearful, but attacking God directly, while in 22,4, the *KJV*’s “Will he reprove thee for fear of thee?” is as possible as “Is it because of your reverence that he reproves you?”

question’s ambiguous character, set precisely in the context in which Eliphaz professes his own attitude towards Job (4,2-7), creates a tension which cries out for continuation”²⁰. As noted above, despite this ambiguity most modern commentators read כסלח here as “your confidence”, “your assurance”, or similarly. Many cite a 1965 study by Moshe Held in which he argues from the comparative philological evidence that the concrete meaning of כסל, representing seven of its 13 biblical occurrences (five times in Leviticus 3–4, as well as Ps 38,7 and Job 15,27), is “sinew, tendon” (rather than “loins, fat of loins” as it has been traditionally interpreted)²¹.

Held goes on to assert that both כסל and the rarer כסלה must mean “strength” when used metaphorically, and so come to connote “confidence”; in his view, the much more common כסיל (“fool”) and the *hapax legomenon* כסילות (“stupidity”) are derived from an unrelated verb meaning “to be or become stupid”²².

While Held’s proposal that the physical meaning of כסל is “sinew, tendon” is convincing, his categorical assertion that כסל and כסלה always mean “strength, confidence” when used metaphorically is less so, as is his proposal for a completely separate semantic development of “fool” from an unrelated verbal root. In the first place, though Held’s study is often quoted in support of the idea that כסלה means “confidence” in Job 4,6, it is worth noting that in his discussion of this verse he is, ironically, more concerned with demonstrating the correctness of the concrete meaning “sinew” from what he assumes to be the derived meaning “strength, confidence”, rather than vice-versa. He argues that כסלח must mean “your confi-

²⁰ BEUKEN, “Job’s Imprecation”, 58-59.

²¹ M. HELD, “Studies in Comparative Semitic Lexicography”, *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday April 21, 1965* (eds. H. GÜTERBOCK et al.) (Chicago, IL 1965) 395-406, here 401-406. Cf. the Ugaritic cognate *ksl* and the Akkadian *ka/islu*.

²² See HELD, “Studies in Comparative Semitic Lexicography”, 406. He proposes that the verbal root כסל in Hebrew denotes “stupidity, bad habits, lack of manners and education, and the like” and compares it to the Akkadian *saklu*. His argument for a completely separate semantic development of “fool” from a different verbal root is tenuous: there is only one example of such a verb in the biblical corpus (Jer 10,8), where it is in parallelism with the denominative verb בער, “to be brutish” (i.e. to be ‘strong and stupid’; see discussion below).

dence” here on the basis of a presumed synonymous parallelism with *תְּקוּתָךְ* in 4,6b, writing that this chapter of Job “is characterized by synonymous parallelism throughout”²³. But while such a statement might be defensible for a passage from Psalms or Proverbs, this is hardly the case for Job. In fact, there are numerous verses in Job 4–5 in which regular synonymous parallelism is not present²⁴. It is therefore imprudent to assume such parallelism in an attempt to demonstrate the meaning of an uncertain term, particularly since the unusual position of the *waw* — i.e. between the two terms in 4,6b, rather than between the two cola — makes such a structure less likely²⁵.

Further, and importantly for the interpretation of Job 4,6, Held does not explain — or even mention — the only other occurrence of *כַּסְלָה* in the biblical corpus (Ps 85,9), where the term is clearly a pejorative:

I will hear what God the LORD will say;
For he will speak peace to his people,
to his godly ones;
But let them not turn back to folly²⁶.

²³ HELD, “Studies in Comparative Semitic Lexicography”, 404, n 126. He also incorrectly asserts that the LXX and Peshitta “clearly read *ותקוּתָךְ תָּם דְּרִכֶּיךָ*” (i.e. transferring the *waw* from *תָּם* to *תְּקוּתָךְ*); neither, in fact, interprets *תָּם דְּרִכֶּיךָ* as the predicate of *ותקוּתָךְ*, and both translate *כַּסְלָה* with a negative term (see below).

²⁴ Cf. 4.2.8.10.13.16 (tricolon).19 (tricolon).20.21; 5.3.15.16.26.27. All of these exhibit “synthetic” or “sequential” parallelism.

²⁵ The fact that the *waw* is attached to *תָּם דְּרִכֶּיךָ* rather than *תְּקוּתָךְ* has been viewed as problematic by many commentators, with a variety of proposals being offered. Some scholars transfer the *waw* to *תְּקוּתָךְ* at the head of the colon (e.g., BALL, *The Book of Job*, 134; K. BUDDE, *Das Buch Hiob übersetzt und erklärt* [Göttingen² 1913] 18), or move *תְּקוּתָךְ* to the end of the verse (e.g., BUTTENWIESER, *The Book of Job*, 162; DUHM, *Das Buch Hiob*, 25), while others have interpreted it as a *waw apodosis* (cf. Gesenius §143d) or as an “emphatic” *waw* (e.g., F. DELITZSCH, *Das Buch Hiob* [Leipzig 1902] 143; E. KÖNIG, *Das Buch Hiob eingeleitet, übersetzt und erklärt* [Gütersloh 1929] 71; A. BLOMMERDE, *Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job* [Rome 1969] 40; HABEL, *The Book of Job*, 115); cf. M. POPE, “Pleonastic Waw before Nouns in Ugaritic and Hebrew”, *JAOS* 73 (1953) 95–98.

²⁶ It is translated as “folly” in BDB and most English versions (e.g., *KJV*, *ASV*, *NASB*, *ESV*, *JPS*). Also cf. the Vulgate’s *stultitiam* (“folly, stupidity”). The Targum’s *סִיאֹר*, lit. “fermentation, leaven”, is a metaphor for an immoral con-

Nor does he address the occurrences of כִּסֵּל in Ps 49,13 and Eccl 7,25, in which the proposed meaning of “strength” or “confidence” would lead to a clearly untenable reading (and where “folly” is the widely accepted interpretation in both cases)²⁷.

This leaves just four other biblical passages, Prov 3,26, Ps 78,7, and Job 8,14 and 31,24, in which *any* form of the root כִּסֵּל is translated with a positive term such as “trust” or “confidence”. None of these occurrences of כִּסֵּל, however, provides a clear parallel to the meaning widely assumed for כִּסֵּלָה in Job 4,6; i.e. that it denotes the existence of a feeling of “confidence” that is viewed as well-founded. In Prov 3,26, for example, most English translations (e.g., “For the LORD will be your confidence ...”) obscures the peculiar syntax of the Hebrew, which reads יְהוָה יְהוּדָה בְּכִסְלֶךָ (lit. “the LORD will be in your כִּסֵּל”). Held proposes that the preposition here is a *beth essentia*, and compares it to the expression בְּעִזָּרִי in Exod 18,4²⁸. The other examples he adduces (Deut 33,26; Ps 146,5) are both dubious, however, and the texts he cites as further comparisons do not have the same construction. Given that the presence of the LORD “in” one’s כִּסֵּל will “keep your foot from being caught” (Prov 3,26b), it seems more likely that the term is instead being used here with its physical meaning of “sinew, tendon”: the LORD will be “in” one’s musculature providing strength, thus preventing the foot from being caught. The use of כִּסֵּל with its physical meaning in Ps 38,7-8 is an apt comparison; in that case, the supplicant is “bent over” and “greatly bowed down” because his כִּסְלִים are “filled with burning”.

Nor does either of the occurrences of כִּסֵּל in Job provide a suitable parallel to כִּסֵּלָה as “confidence” or “trust” in Job 4,6; in both cases, the context indicates that the כִּסֵּל is — or would be — mis-

dition or evil nature (i.e. heathenism). The Peshitta renders the colon as an admonition to the people not to turn back to their previous (sinful) ways. Some exegetes emend לְכִסְלָהּ to לִבָּם לָהּ (following the LXX’s πρὸς αὐτὸν καρδίαν); the RSV, for example, translates the colon as “to those who turn to him in their hearts”. This would, however, also require the deletion of the לָהּ. In any case, the LXX renders כִּסֵּלָה in Job 4,6 as ἀφροσύνη (“folly”); see below.

²⁷ Also cf. the post-biblical sense of כִּסֵּל as “laziness, inactivity” (Jastrow compares it to טִפְשׁ, “be obdurate, dull, stupid”), and the Arabic cognate *kasila* (“to be sluggish”). See M. JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York 1950) 654.

²⁸ HELD, “Studies in Comparative Semitic Lexicography”, 403.

placed. In Job 8,12-14, Bildad asserts that the paths of all those who forget God will “wither like plants”:

So are the paths of all who forget God;
And the hope of the godless will perish,
Whose confidence is fragile,
And whose trust a spider’s web.

In Job 31,24, the context also indicates that this “confidence” is a false one (“If I have made gold my confidence [כסל], and called fine gold my trust ...”).

Given these usages, along with the widely accepted interpretation of כסל as “folly” in Ps 49,13 and Eccl 7,25, the derived meaning of כסל is in my opinion best interpreted as “stubborn foolishness”, i.e. an overconfident, obdurate stupidity²⁹. It would therefore be analogous to the biblical condemnations against those who are “stiff-necked” (e.g., Exod 32,8) or who “harden their hearts” (e.g., 1 Sam 6,6)³⁰. It also eliminates the need to posit two entirely separate semantic developments for “fool” and “confidence”, as Held proposes.

To summarize the foregoing discussion, in order to interpret Eliphaz’s words to Job in 4,6 as an affirmation of his righteousness, one must assume not only an unusual use of יראה to mean “reverence” (i.e. without an explicit reference to the deity), but also that the meaning of כסלה is the same as an already questionable derived meaning of the segholate noun כסל. Further, one of Held’s main arguments in support of this questionable meaning is based, ironically, on Job 4,6, where he assumes regular synonymous parallelism despite the peculiar position of the *waw* conjunction.

²⁹ This meaning is also appropriate for the other passage in which כסל is typically translated as “confidence” or “trust” (Ps 78,5-8). Here the term occurs in a charge to the Israelites to instruct their children not to forget “God’s great deeds” and be a “wayward and defiant generation with an inconstant heart” like their fathers, but instead to make God their כסל. The idea here would be similar to that of the verb הטהלל (“boast, glorify oneself”): on its own, the term can indicate an arrogant overconfidence (e.g., 1 Kgs 20,11), but it takes on a positive connotation when used with ביהוה as a complement (e.g., Ps 34,3, “My soul will make its boast in the LORD”).

³⁰ Also perhaps to לב שרירות (“stubborn of heart”, e.g., Jer 13,10); cf. שרירי בשני “sinews [?] of his belly” in Job 40,16.

If, on the other hand, כסלה is read with the meaning that it has in its only other biblical occurrence in Ps 85,9 (“folly, stupidity”), then 4,6 could be translated as “Is not your fear your folly? Your hope, and the integrity of your ways?” Whether יראתך is an ellipsis for “your fear of God” or the more literal “your fright”, the two cola would then be in synthetic/sequential parallelism, with יראתך, תקותך, and ותם דרכיך all serving as subjects of the predicate nominative כסלתך. This interpretation would also account for the location of the *waw* in 4,6b (ותם דרכיך תקותך), which would retain its most common function as a coordinating conjunction without any emendation being required.

This is in fact the interpretation offered by Rashi ³¹, and indeed most of the ancient Versions and traditional authorities read Eliphaz’s words here as criticism rather than praise ³². The translators of the Septuagint, for example, glossed כסלה with ἀφροσύνη (“folly”), interpreted it as the predicate of the other three terms, and translated the verse as a strong indictment of Job:

Πότερον οὐχ ὁ φόβος σου ἐστὶν	Is your fear not founded
ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ,	in folly,
καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς σου	your hope also,
καὶ ἡ ἀκακία τῆς ὁδοῦ σου	and the mischief ³³ of your way?

The translators of the Peshitta also perceived a condemnation, rendering כסלתך with בגלך (“your blame, censure, accusation”), while the Vulgate renders the entire verse as a question that — though different in sense from the Septuagint and Peshitta — is also clearly critical: *timor tuus fortitudo tua patientia tua et perfectio viarum tuarum* (“your fear, your fortitude, your patience, and the perfection of your ways”) ³⁴.

³¹ *Mikra’ot Gedolot Sefer Iyov*, 14.

³² Cf. HOFFMAN, “Equivocal Words”, 115. Among traditional authorities, cf. e.g., John Chrysostom (*Johannes Chrysostomos Kommentar zu Hiob herausgegeben und übersetzt von Ursula und Dieter Hagedorn* [PTS 35; New York 1990] 61); Gersonides (*Mikra’ot Gedolot Sefer Iyov*, 16), and R. Joseph Kara (*Perush Rabi Yosef Kara le-Sefer Iyov* [Yerushalayim 1988] 11).

³³ One manuscript reads ἀκακία, “guilelessness”, which seems a better fit with the MT’s תם.

³⁴ All of the ancient Versions — even the Targum, which renders כסלה positively as סבוייך (“your hopes, prospects”) — read the two cola as being

There are also contextual and intertextual reasons to prefer this interpretation. As discussed above, in 4,3-4 Eliphaz has utilized terminology that elsewhere describes the symptoms of fear, and the last word of 4,5 — immediately preceding *יראתך* — is the verb *והבהל*, which I have argued should be translated as “you are terrified”. If *יראה* here is read as “fear” rather than “reverence”, then once again a semantic parallel to the fear imagery of 3,25 (as well as 4,3-4) is created.

The second colon (*תקוהך והם דרכיך*) continues both Eliphaz’s critique and his parallelistic “response” to the last section of Job 3. Both expressions exhibit distant semantic parallelism with terms in Job’s opening speech: *תקוה* can be viewed as a response to Job’s mention of “those who long for (*מהכים ל*) death” and rejoice when they find it in 3,21-22, as well as to Job’s overarching desire that he had never been born. According to this intertextual reading of Eliphaz’s words, he considers such hope — like Job’s “fear” — to be “folly”.

Finally, the last term in 4,6b, *דרכיך*, is in distant repetitive parallelism with *דרכו* in 3,23. As such, it will be helpful to view the term in its context in that verse in order to clarify the sense of Eliphaz’s “response.”

VI. Job 4,6b in light of Job 3,23

Job 3,23 reads:

Why is light given to a man whose way is hidden,
And whom God has hedged in?

This verse is a continuation of Job’s question as to why “light” and “life” are given to those who “suffer” and are “bitter of spirit” in 3,21. Interpreters have long recognized the second colon as an ironic allusion to Job 1,10, in which the *šātān* tells God that Job’s righteousness is only due to the fact that God has protected him by “hedging him in”³⁵. Here, however, Job characterizes such “hedg-

in synthetic rather than regular synonymous parallelism. Also see N. TURSINAI, *The Book of Job. A New Commentary* (Jerusalem 1967) 76-78.

³⁵ Cf. e.g., HABEL, *The Book of Job*, 112; CLINES, *Job 1-20*, 101; ANDERSEN, *Job*, 109; PEAKE, *Job*, 76, and many others.

ing” negatively, either as a “cage” from which he cannot escape or, in Tur-Sinai’s view, a barrier or screen that separates him from God ³⁶.

The sense of the first colon is also clearly negative, but in one respect it is ambiguous: it is clear that the man’s “way is hidden”, but from whom? Nothing in the grammar of the verse provides a definitive answer. Some interpreters are of the opinion that it is Job himself, and that the phrase refers to some sort of existential crisis on his part, i.e. that he has “lost his way” ³⁷. Others, however, argue that the “way” is not hidden from the “man,” but rather from God. Rashbam expresses this opinion in his medieval commentary, writing that “Job says this about himself: ‘All this has happened to me because my path is hidden from God’” ³⁸. Rashi’s interpretation is similar: he writes that “all the good deeds he has done are hidden from the Lord of Recompense, and he does not regard them” ³⁹. Ehrlich and Tur-Sinai are among the more modern proponents of this view, with the latter asserting that the idea behind Job’s statement is that God does not recognize the man’s “blameless way” (see below) ⁴⁰.

It is impossible to say with certainty whether Job or God is intended here, given the ambiguity of the expression. As with some of the verses discussed above, however, an intertextual reading of 3,23a may shed light on the poet’s intent ⁴¹. A number of commen-

³⁶ Tur-Sinai notes the orthographic variation between the verb in 1,10 (שָׁכַח) and that in 3,23b (וַיִּסְךְ); he interprets the latter as being derived from the root סָכַךְ, “to screen”. He observes that this term is “used especially of the cloudy curtain which God spreads between himself and man”. If he is correct, then the poet is very cleverly maintaining the *paronomasia* with 1,10 while at the same time continuing the idea introduced in 3,23a: that God does not see Job’s “way”. See N. TUR-SINAI, *The Book of Job*, 66.

³⁷ E.g., DRIVER-GRAY, *Commentary*, 39; HABEL, *The Book of Job*, 111-112. The *NRSV*’s translation (“Why is light given to one who cannot see the way [...]”) makes this interpretation explicit, though such paraphrasing departs significantly from the Hebrew original.

³⁸ S. JAPHET, *Perush R. Shemu’el ben Me’ir (Rashbam) le-Sefer Iyov (Yerushalayim 2000)* 353.

³⁹ כל טובות אשר פעל נסחרו מאת בעל הנמול ולא הביט בהם, see *Mikra’ot Gedolot Sefer Iyov*, 13.

⁴⁰ A.B. EHRLICH, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel* (Leipzig 1918) 192; N.H. TUR-SINAI, *Sefer Iyov: ‘im perush hadash* (Tel-Aviv 1954) 38, and *The Book of Job*, 66.

⁴¹ See J. BURNIGHT, “The ‘Reversal’ of *Heilsgeschichte* in Job 3”, *Reading Job Intertextually* (eds. K. DELL – W. KYNES) (LHBOTS 574; London 2012) 30-41, here 38.

tators have compared the use of the expression נסתר ררכו here to the occurrence of the same phrase in Isa 40,27⁴²:

Why do you say, O Jacob,
And assert, O Israel,
“My way is hidden from the LORD,
And the justice due me escapes
the notice of my God?”

It is noteworthy that this is the only other occurrence of this expression in the Hebrew Bible. Here, Isaiah is comforting the people by assuring them that the LORD is indeed aware of their (righteous) conduct, and in the next few verses the prophet asserts that their God will provide them with “rest” from their troubles (cf. Isa 40,28-31). In Job 3,23, however, Job echoes Israel’s question but then goes on to complain about his lack of “rest” in 3,26 (see discussion of 4,1 above). Many scholars have remarked upon the numerous thematic and intertextual links between Deutero-Isaiah and Job⁴³. If this is in fact another such case, then the implication is clear: as he has already indicated in the previous section (cf. 3,11-19), Job sees death as the only sure guarantor of true rest. To Job, Isaiah’s promise that God does indeed take note of the righteous “way” of his servants is empty, for he believes that he has been abandoned to his suffering.

Eliphaz, in turn, recognizes Job’s allusion and attempts to defend his understanding of God’s justice. Just as in 4,2 he responded to Job’s complaint of “exhaustion” in 3,26, and in 4,3-5 he rebuked Job for his “fear” in 3,25, in 4,6 he castigates Job for his elliptical self-justification, with the implication that God no longer perceives

⁴² In addition to Ehrlich and Tur-Sinai (cited above), see also Y. PYEON, *You Have Not Spoken What Is Right about Me*. Intertextuality and the Book of Job (Studies in Biblical Literature 45; New York 2003) 71; SEOW, *Job 1–21*, 369-370; and several others.

⁴³ E.g., STRAHAN, *The Book of Job Interpreted*, 19; A. DAVIDSON – G. LAN-CHES-TER, *The Book of Job* (Cambridge 1918) lxx; R. GORDIS, *The Book of God and Man* (Chicago, IL 1965) 145-149, 214-216, and *The Book of Job*. Commentary. New Translation, and Special Studies (New York 1978) xxxi; J. CRENSHAW, “Popular Questioning of the Justice of God in Ancient Israel”, *ZAW* 82 (1970) 380-395 (see esp. 389); J. WHARTON, *Job* (Louisville, KY 1999) 10-11; and many others.

his good conduct. Eliphaz accuses Job of failing to recognize what in his view is clearly divine punishment: according to his strictly retributive theology (cf. 4,7-9, discussed below), he believes that Job must have sinned to be suffering so, but — rather than turning to God in supplication as Eliphaz himself would have done (cf. 5,8) — Job has responded foolishly (בְּסִלְחָךְ) by giving vent to his fear (יִרְאָתְךָ) in 3,25, expressing his longing for death (תְּקוּתָךְ) in 3,21-22, and complaining that God does not see his righteous ways (תָּם דְּרִכֶּיךָ) in 3,23.

This intertextual reading of 4,6 also removes the apparent contradiction with Eliphaz’s statement in 5,17: “How happy is the man whom God reproves / So do not despise the discipline of the Almighty”. If Eliphaz is asserting Job’s moral excellence in 4,6, then for what is Job being “disciplined” in this later verse⁴⁴? If, however, Eliphaz is being critical in 4,6, then there is no contradiction; both verses reflect Eliphaz’s belief that Job has sinned, and should acknowledge this and accept his punishment, rather than responding by tacitly (thus far) accusing God of being unjust.

VII. Job 4,7: is Job innocent or guilty?

The reading of 4,2-6 that I have outlined above also accounts for a number of puzzling elements that have been noted by commentators in connection with 4,7-11.

4,7 Remember now, who ever perished being innocent?
Or where were the upright destroyed?

This verse is frequently interpreted as Eliphaz reassuring Job that, being innocent, he need not fear dying. If this is Eliphaz’s intent, however, then he has chosen a poor way to “comfort” his friend; as Terrien writes,

⁴⁴ Crenshaw follows the majority of modern interpreters in viewing 4,6 as Eliphaz’s affirmation of Job’s moral rectitude, but notes that the verse is then at odds with 5,8, in which Eliphaz urges him to seek El; see J. CRENSHAW, “Divine Discipline in Job 5:17-18, Proverbs 3:11-12, Deuteronomy 32:39, and Beyond”, *Reading Job Intertextually* (eds. K. DELL – W. KYNES) (LHBOTS 574; London 2012) 179, n. 2.

Eliphaz as being kindly disposed toward Job. In addition, nowhere in chapter 3 has Job advanced the argument that the wicked prosper or somehow avoid punishment (though he will do so later in the dialogue); indeed, the only mention of wrongdoers made by Job at this early stage is in 3,17, where they are listed as one among several groups who are at peace in the grave. Eliphaz could hardly comfort Job by promising that they — and not he — will experience the fate for which he himself longs.

VIII. Job 4,8: Eliphaz's view of the relationship between sin and suffering

Instead, Eliphaz's words in 4,8 can be viewed as a sharp response to one of the central themes of Job's opening poem in chapter 3. As many scholars have noted, 4,8 appears to be a paraphrase or imitation of an agricultural metaphor like that found in Hos 10,13 ("You have plowed wickedness, you have reaped injustice") or Prov 22,8 ("He who sows iniquity will reap vanity")⁵². Eliphaz, though, uses a term not found in these other proverbial expressions, עֲמַל:

4,8 According to what I have seen, those who plow iniquity
And those who sow trouble harvest it.

The occurrence of the term here creates two instances of distant repetitive parallelism with Job's opening speech: Eliphaz claims that he "has seen" (רָאִיתִי) the relationship between wickedness and suffering, while Job has previously lamented in 3,10 that עֲמַל had not been "hidden from his eyes", and has asked in 3,20 "why light is given" to the עֲמַל⁵³. Dhorme calls Eliphaz's use of עֲמַל here "insulting" in that it strongly implies that Job has caused his own mis-

⁵² Also Hos 8,7 ("For they sow the wind, and they reap the whirlwind") and Joel 3,13.

⁵³ Cf. BEUKEN ("Job's Imprecation", 49), who writes: "The fact that Eliphaz takes over and exploits a term, which Job uses to typify his situation, in an expression which actually condemns him, might be explained either as a striking lack of sensitivity for what Job has said, or as an intentional correction of Job's outlook on life. In any case the term constitutes a line of correspondence between Job's complaint and Eliphaz's reply".

fortune ⁵⁴. By placing the term in regular semantic parallelism with אִי, he makes his previous assertion in 4,7 — i.e. that suffering is invariably the result of sin — even more explicit.

IX. Job 4,9-11: images of divine punishment

The punishment of these evildoers is described metaphorically in the last three verses of this section, 4,9-11:

- 4,9 By the breath of God they perish,
And by the blast of his anger they come to an end.
4,10 The roaring of the lion and the voice of the fierce lion,
And the teeth of the young lions are broken.
4,11 The lion perishes for lack of prey,
And the whelps of the lioness are scattered.

The figures of the “breath” of God and the “wind of his nostrils” as instruments of divine punishment are frequent in the Hebrew Bible ⁵⁵, and several of the words for “lions” occur often as metaphors for the wicked ⁵⁶. As mentioned above, a number of commentators delete these verses in whole or in part; it is frequently remarked that the content of this section does not match the putatively positive message of the rest of Eliphaz’s speech. Even among those who believe that the verses are original, there are a number who observe that the language used is at best insensitive, and at worst cruel, given Job’s situation as described in the prologue ⁵⁷.

⁵⁴ DHORME, *Le livre de Job*, 42; ET: *The Book of Job*, 46.

⁵⁵ E.g., Exod 15,8; 2 Sam 22,9.16; Ps 18,15; Isa 30,28.33; 40,7; 59,9; Hos 13,15; Ps 18,8.15.

⁵⁶ Cf. e.g., Jer 2,15; 12,8 (as a symbol for wicked Israel, who is said to “roar” against the LORD); Ezek 19,2; Nah 2,11-12; Pss 10,9; 17,12; 22,14.22; 34,10; 58,6; Prov 28,15.

⁵⁷ CLINES (*Job 1–20*, 124-125), for example, calls Eliphaz’s remarks “cruel” and “doubly hurtful” in that they implicitly attribute the death of Job’s children to some sinfulness of theirs, writing that this “is even worse in Job’s case since he had constantly gone out of his way to ensure that any shortcomings on their part had been adequately atoned for by sacrifice (1:5) [...]”. Clines nevertheless believes that Eliphaz’s words are “meant in a kindly spirit”, despite the harshness of the resulting statements.

Newsom, for example, notes that the destructive wind in 4,9 recalls the “great wind” that crushed Job’s children (1,19), while Terrien, among others, suggests that the reference to the “whelps being scattered” in 4,11 may also be a subtle reference to their fate ⁵⁸.

If, however, the earlier verses in this chapter are sharply critical of Job (as I have argued above), then Eliphaz’s supposed insensitivity and otherwise peculiar emphasis on the fate of the wicked is understandable: he considers Job to be among them. Some of the terminology in 4,9-11 seems, like much of that in 4,1-8, deliberately targeted at elements of Job’s complaint in 3,20-26. The use of שִׁאֲנָה in 4,10a, for example, creates a distant repetitive parallelism with 3,24, in which Job states that his “roars pour out like water” ⁵⁹. The reference to the lion having its “teeth shattered” and “perishing from a lack of prey (טֶרֶף)” also creates a distant semantic parallelism with 3,24, where Job states that his “sighs come in place of his food (לֶחֶם)”. By utilizing imagery that evokes Job’s suffering in his description of the fate of the wicked, Eliphaz is implying that his misfortune is indeed due to his — and his family’s — own wickedness.

X. Conclusion: Eliphaz’s words in 4,2-11 as a “response” to Job’s complaint

I propose that the first section of Eliphaz’s speech (4,2-11) serves as a poetic “response” to Job’s complaint in 3,20-26: Eliphaz recognizes Job’s tacit accusations against God and defends the traditional Israelite theology of retribution by asserting that God has inflicted Job’s suffering with cause. In doing so he makes frequent use of language and imagery that evoke the earlier descriptions of Job’s plight. The reference to “exhaustion” in 4,2, for example, recalls Job’s complaint that he is unable to find “rest” in 3,26. In 4,3-5 Eliphaz uses imagery that elsewhere in the Bible is used to describe the “fear” of those experiencing divine punishment, evoking the “fear” imagery in 3,25 (and so implying that Job’s wickedness has caused “what he feared” to occur). Job 4,6 continues this theme, denouncing not only Job’s “fear” but also his “hope” (i.e.

⁵⁸ NEWSOM, “Job”, 377; TERRIEN, “Job”, 938. Also see SEOW, *Job 1–21*, 386.

⁵⁹ These are, in fact, the only two instances of שִׁאֲנָה in Job (though the verb שִׁאֲנָה occurs in Job 37,4).

for death) and his tacit claim in 3,23 that God does not see his “righteous ways”. In 4,7-8, Eliphaz “answers” Job’s question about why God allows suffering (3,20) by asserting that עַמַּל is inextricably related to sin. He then attempts to support his assertion with a series of what Habel terms “validating proverbs” in 4,9-11 ⁶⁰, implying with his reference to the “roaring” lion in 4,10 (cf. 3,24) that Job’s tacit critique of God places him in danger of becoming one of the wicked.

When read this way, Eliphaz’s position is consistent throughout not only chapters 4–5, but also in his subsequent speeches in chapters 15 and 22 (which would then not differ materially in content, but only in intensity of expression): he believes that Job and his family must have sinned to have suffered so, but asserts that if Job would only acknowledge his sin and accept the divine chastisement (5,17), he would be restored (5,18-26).

As the prologue makes clear, however, Job cannot repent, for he knows of no sin that he has committed; Eliphaz’s accusations thus provoke him to anger, explaining the tenor of Job’s remarks in chapters 6–7 (see especially 6,14-18), which indicate that he feels anything but comforted by his friend’s words. On the contrary, Eliphaz’s defense of the traditional doctrine of retribution fails utterly to convince Job, and the tone of the exchanges between Job and his “friends” will grow ever more contentious as the dialogue continues. The recognition of the intertextual element of the poet’s strategy can, in not a few cases, help to illuminate some of the otherwise puzzling lexical or rhetorical choices found in the poem. It can also demonstrate that, rather than “talking past each other” (as has often been alleged) ⁶¹, the characters are in fact “conversing”, albeit in an ingenious and subtle way.

University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, IA 50613
U.S.A.

John BURNIGHT

⁶⁰ HABEL, *The Book of Job*, 123.

⁶¹ Norman Snaith’s comments (*The Book of Job; Its Origin and Purpose* [Naperville, IL 1968] 8) typify this view; he writes that the series of speeches is “scarcely a dialogue in any normal sense of the word. In the Book of Job we have a dialogue only in the sense that they all speak in turn, one after the other [...]. The content of each speech is usually strangely independent of what has gone before and what follows”.

SUMMARY

It is widely believed that the Joban poet presents Eliphaz as seeking to reassure Job in his first speech, and only later accuses him of wrongdoing. One prominent exegete, for example, remarks that Eliphaz “begins considerately, and proceeds with notable gentleness and courtesy” (Terrien). In this paper I propose that Eliphaz’s opening words are neither gentle nor reassuring. Instead, they are a sharp intertextual response to Job’s complaints that he can find no “rest” (3,26) and that what he “feared has come upon him” (3,25). In essence, Eliphaz is implying that Job has brought his suffering on himself.

Cléophas et Lydie: un ‘couple’ lucanien hautement théologique

Les exégètes, tout comme les simples lecteurs, ont depuis longtemps remarqué l'intérêt particulier de Luc pour les femmes. Il est fréquent que Luc crée des scènes mettant en valeur les femmes là où les autres évangélistes ne représentent que les hommes. Par ailleurs Luc est aussi le seul évangéliste à avoir créé une œuvre double, ou une œuvre unique en deux volumes: Luc et Actes. Les échos et reprises entre les deux livres sont nombreux et contribuent à créer un effet de continuité qui est au service de la théologie lucanienne: celle-ci en effet tient à mettre en valeur la continuité qui unit le Christ aux prophètes d'une part ¹ et celle qui unit les Apôtres (Pierre et Paul en particulier) avec Jésus. La nouveauté bien sûr n'est pas mise sous le boisseau mais située dans un mouvement qui souligne l'unité du dessein divin depuis les origines. Pour n'en donner qu'un seul exemple bien connu, s'il est vrai que les premiers disciples prient dans leurs maisons, ils continuent cependant de se rendre également au Temple (cf. Ac 2,46).

Pour unifier son œuvre, relativement importante par la taille, Luc utilise tous les moyens à la disposition d'un auteur hellénistique. Des scènes sont reprises ou se font écho (ainsi la rencontre du centurion Corneille est préparée par celle du centurion pour lequel Jésus effectue une guérison). En outre — selon une technique sans doute universelle et en tout cas déjà bien présente dans l'Ancien Testament ² — des passerelles entre péricopes sont créées par la reprise d'expressions, de noms ou de verbes qui évoquent une scène antérieure ³. C'est ainsi, là encore, pour ne donner qu'un

¹ A cette christologie prophétique fondamentale appartient aussi la *syn-krisis* opérée entre Jésus et Jean Baptiste. Cf. H. MAHFOUZ, *La fonction littéraire et théologique de Lc 3,1-20 dans Luc-Actes* (Beyrouth 2003).

² M. Buber et F. Rosenzweig ont souligné la place des *Leitwörter* dans la Torah (M. BUBER – F. ROSENZWEIG, *Scripture and Translation* (Bloomington, MN 1994).

³ R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York ²2011 [1981]) 120-121, relève que l'emploi de *Leitwörter* est souvent lié à la reprise de 'scènes-types'.

exemple bien connu, que, lors de la tempête qui le frappe, Paul prend le pain et le bénit d'une façon qui ne peut que renvoyer le lecteur aux multiplications des pains de l'évangile et à la dernière Cène (cf. Actes 27). Les catégories du droit canonique sont ici peu pertinentes pour dire si Paul a accompli ou pas une eucharistie en bonne et due forme pour des non-baptisés. La technique de la *synkrisis*, de la comparaison ordonnée, est un des procédés littéraires les plus utilisés par Luc. Comme le résume D. Marguerat: "La *synkrisis* crée un réseau d'intertextualité interne à l'œuvre lucanienne. Elle rapproche deux figures du récit à l'enseigne d'un événement analogue (comme le martyr de Jésus et d'Etienne) ou par le biais d'un même scénario narratif (comme la rencontre d'Emmaüs et la conversion de l'Ethiopien)"⁴. Ce qui est sûr, c'est que les échos sont réels et que Luc les a voulus pour créer des ponts avec son premier livre et un effet de continuité entre l'action de Paul et celle de Jésus.

Nous aimerions dans cette note nous pencher sur un parallèle peu remarqué: celui qui unit la scène des disciples d'Emmaüs à la fin de l'évangile (Lc 21,13-33a) et celle qui marque la rencontre entre Paul et un groupe de femmes après son arrivée en Europe, en la ville de Philippes (Ac 16,5-11).

I. Un verbe rare

Dans ces deux passages, on rencontre le verbe παραβιάζομαι qui est diversement traduit mais qui signifie que l'on contraint ou exerce de fortes pressions sur autrui pour qu'il fasse ce que l'on attend de lui. Il est étonnant que ce verbe soit si diversement traduit dans les deux passages alors que les deux contextes sont analogues. Dans le premier récit, Cléophas et son compagnon, qui ont longuement écouté Jésus sans prendre conscience de son identité, lui demandent de rester avec eux dans l'auberge. Dans le second récit, Lydie (qui a des compagnes avec elle), demande à Paul de demeurer dans sa maison. Le verbe en question ne se trouve que dans ces deux versets en Luc (et nulle part ailleurs dans le NT d'ailleurs).

⁴ D. MARGUERAT, "Lc-Ac une unité à construire", *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. VERHEYDEN) (BETL 142; Leuven 1999) 57-81, 71. Sur l'importance de cette technique chez Luc, cf. J.-N. ALETTI, *Quand Luc raconte*. Le récit comme théologie (LB 115; Paris 1998) 69-112.

Son emploi en Luc 24 constitue une prolepse d'Actes 16 et sa reprise en Actes 16 une analepse de Luc 24 ⁵. Comme le montre la consultation du *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, le verbe est rare et sa présence peut difficilement être accidentelle. Mais les liens qui unissent les deux scènes ne reposent pas que sur ce seul terme. Loin de là.

Il est éclairant d'effectuer une comparaison entre les traductions des deux passages. En effet, le verbe n'est que rarement traduit de la même façon, comme si Cléophas et son compagnon ne pouvaient agir envers Jésus de la façon dont Lydie agit envers Paul et ses compagnons. Cette question de l'exégèse féministe est légitime et mérite d'être posée. C'est en français que les traductions diffèrent le plus ⁶. L'aspect de contrainte est nettement marqué dans le cas de Lydie ("forcer" est plus fort que "s'efforcer"!) tandis que les disciples d'Emmaüs apparaissent plus respectueux. Serait-ce qu'il serait difficile d'envisager qu'une quelconque 'contrainte' soit exercée à l'égard de Jésus? En italien, une édition (la *San Paolo*) a choisi en revanche le même verbe pour les deux occurrences ⁷. En allemand, Luther distinguait les verbes, et celui employé pour Lydie a une connotation plus violente: les dernières traductions allemandes en revanche sont cohérentes dans l'emploi du même terme, plus ou moins adouci ⁸. En anglais, la situation est, comme toujours, plus complexe (les traductions sont extrêmement nombreuses) mais la *Bible de Tyndale*, tout comme la *King James*, maintenaient bien le même verbe à la différence de traduc-

⁵ Pour un procédé analogue à l'intérieur de la Genèse, cf. M. RASTOIN, "Suis-je à la place de Dieu, moi? Note sur Gn 30,2 et 50,19 et l'intention théologique de la Genèse", *RB* 114 (2007) 333-347.

⁶ Pour Lc 24,29a, la *BJ* et la *TOB* ont "ils le pressèrent en disant", et la traduction liturgique "ils s'efforcèrent de le retenir", tandis que pour Ac 16,15, la *BJ* a "elle nous y contraignit", la *TOB* "elle nous a forcés d'accepter" et la traduction liturgique (2013) "elle nous a forcé la main". Je remercie ma collègue Odile Flichy qui a attiré mon attention sur cette divergence et m'a incité à me pencher sur ce passage.

⁷ Pour Lc 24,29a, la *San Paolo* a "lo costrinsero a fermarsi" et la *Nuova Sacra Biblia Riveduta* (1994) "Essi lo trattennero", tandis que pour Ac 16,15, la *San Paolo* a "E ci costrinse ad accettare", et la *NSBR* "E ci costrinse ad accettare".

⁸ Pour Lc 24,29a, la *Bible de Luther* de 1545 et la même révisée (1984) ont "sie nötigten ihn", et la *Einheit-Übersetzung* (1993) "sie drängten ihn", tandis que pour Ac 16,15, la *Bible de Luther* 1545 a "sie zwang uns", celle de 1984 "sie nötigte uns", et la *Einheit-Übersetzung*, "sie drängte uns".

tions plus récentes, qui ont quant à elles tendance à adoucir le verbe en Luc et à le durcir en Actes ⁹.

Que pouvons-nous en déduire? D'une part que les traducteurs jugent le plus souvent inutile de donner à entendre le parallèle et, d'autre part, que la situation les incite à penser qu'une traduction différente du verbe s'impose. Cette différence de traduction est-elle vraiment justifiée? Il nous semble que non. La situation narrative est extrêmement proche. Dans les deux cas, dans le cadre d'une discussion profonde et amicale, l'un des deux partenaires insiste pour que son interlocuteur accepte de passer la nuit avec lui (avec eux). Parler de "courtoisie orientale" ¹⁰ passe à côté de la portée théologique de la demande. Ce n'est pas par un éventuel souci de couleur locale que Luc a voulu cet écho.

II. Un écho insuffisamment relevé

Si l'on regarde quelques commentaires de référence, on constate que cet écho (et a fortiori les points de contact entre les deux péricopes) est soit tout simplement passé sous silence soit, dans le meilleur des cas, expédié en une ligne ¹¹. C'est ainsi que,

⁹ Pour Lc 24,29a, la *Bible de Tyndale* (1534), la *King James* de 1611 et la *RSV* (1952) ont "they constrained him", la *NRSV* (1989) "they urged him strongly", la *NJB* (1985) "they pressed him" et la *NAB* (1970) "they urged him", tandis que pour Ac 16,15, la *Bible de Tyndale* 1534 et la *KJ* de 1611 ont "she constrained us", la *RSV*, la *NRSV* et la *NAB*, "she prevailed upon us" et la *NJB* "she would take no refusal".

¹⁰ Cf. G. ROSSÉ, *Atti degli Apostoli*. Commento esegetico e teologico (Roma 1998) 608: "come in Luca 24,29 ... l'insistenza fa parte della cortesia orientale (Haenchen)".

¹¹ Cf. les principaux commentaires de référence comme ceux de E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles*. A Commentary (Oxford 1971 [1965]) 495 (qui mentionne le verbe παραβιάζομαι en lien avec Gn 33,11 LXX mais sans évoquer Lc 24,29), R. PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (EKK 5.2; Zürich 1986) 106-118 (qui mentionne le mot en commun avec Lc 24,29 mais sans commenter), F.F. BRUCE, *The Book of the Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI 1988) 310, J. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York 1998) 581-586, C.K. BARRETT, *The Acts of the Apostles*. A Shorter Commentary (Edinburg 2002) 784 (en note le parallèle avec Lc 24,29), D.L. BOCK, *Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI 2007) 533, et D. PETERSON, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids, MI 2009) 458-462. R. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*. A Literary Inter-

dans leur commentaire, Jean Radermakers et Philippe Bossuyt écrivent à propos du moment de la conversion du cœur de Lydie: “Alors se produit pour elle un événement semblable à la rencontre d’Emmaüs : son cœur s’ouvre aux paroles de la Bonne Nouvelle annoncée par Paul”¹². Ce sont les deux auteurs qui insistent le plus sur ce parallèle. Richard Pervo, en général sensible aux résonances littéraires à l’intérieur du corpus lucanien, ne manque pas de relever le point en écrivant: “Lydia’s ‘compelling’ argument is the second possible allusion to Luke 24 in two verses”. Il ajoute cependant: “Lydia is the Cornelius of this mission ... She is the Martha of Acts”¹³, ce qui montre qu’il juge plus important le thème de l’hospitalité en tant que telle. Cependant, même s’il voit bien que les parallèles vont au-delà de ce seul terme mais s’étendent aux situations mêmes, il ne développe pas davantage. D’autres auteurs vont dans le même sens.

L’épisode de Lydie a fait l’objet d’une monographie récente¹⁴ qui, cependant, ne développe pas cet écho avec la scène d’Emmaüs. L’auteur remarque certes la reprise du verbe παραβιάζομαι avant de procéder vers la fin de sa thèse à une relecture de l’ensemble de la scène. Il a bien repéré, comme beaucoup avant lui, l’emploi du même verbe qu’en Luc 24 et note: “Die Wortwahl bildet eine sub-

pretation. Vol. 1: The Gospel according to Luke (Philadelphia, PA 1986) 207, n. 1, observe le double parallèle sans le commenter.

¹² J. RADERMAKERS – P. BOSSUYT, *Témoins de la Parole de la Grâce*. Lecture des Actes des Apôtres (Bruxelles 1995) 512. La note précise: “Le vocabulaire est semblable: ouvrir/cœur/parler (Lc 24,32) et entrer/demeurer/contraindre (Lc 24,29)”.

¹³ Cf. R. PERVO, *Acts. A Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN 2009) 404. Dans la même ligne, A. DENAUX, “The Theme of Divine Visits and Human (In)hospitality in Luke-Acts”, J. VERHEYDEN (éd.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL 142; Leuven 1999) 255-279, et A. DENAUX, “The Theme of Divine stranger on earth and divine guest: Human and Divine Hospitality in the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts”, P. GEEST et al. (éds.), *Strangers and Pilgrims on Earth. Essays in Honour of Abraham van de Beek* (Leiden 2011) 87-100. Ils établissent bien l’arrière-plan hellénistique du thème de la descente des dieux parmi les hommes et l’importance corrélatrice de l’hospitalité.

¹⁴ Cf. J.P. STERCK-DEGUELDRE, *Eine Frau Namens Lydia. Zu Geschichte und Komposition in Apostelgeschichte 16,11–15.40* (Tübingen 2004). De même, F. LESTANG, *Les figures individuelles de croyants dans le deuxième voyage missionnaire de Paul (Ac 16,6–18,18)* (Pendé 2012) 77, se contente d’une ligne pour relever le parallèle.

tile und dennoch gezielte Anspielung auf die dringliche Bitte der Emmaus-Jünger (Lk 24,29)”¹⁵. Les conclusions qu’il en tire sont cependant minimales. Dans son étude sur les conversions domestiques dans les Actes, L. Matson note avec justesse à propos de la dimension quasi-sacramentelle dans les deux scènes : “The fascinating parallels between this account [Lc 24,31] and the story of Lydia suggest that Paul’s eating in the house of Lydia was similarly eucharistic in nature”, mais le propos n’est pas développé davantage. Il privilégie (comme R. Pervo) un autre écho : “Lydia functions as a kind of female Cornelius”¹⁶.

Avant J.P. Sterck-Degueldre, ce sont surtout des exégètes féministes qui se sont penchés sur le passage notamment Luise Schottroff. Ce qui les intéresse cependant en premier lieu, c’est la profession et le statut social de Lydie d’une part et d’autre part la façon dont elle, une femme seule, accueille Paul. Pour L. Schottroff, les exégètes masculins ont trop longtemps voulu souligner le statut élevé de Lydia alors qu’il s’agit d’une pauvre femme qui s’est faite toute seule suite à un dur labeur. Elle souligne que le nom laisse entendre une origine servile et que le métier consistant à travailler la pourpre était un métier méprisé (analogue à celui des tanneurs). Elle a été peu suivie dans cette lecture. Il est peu probable en effet, au vu du contexte (maison, domesticité, connaissance du judaïsme, etc.), que Lydie soit une simple ouvrière de l’industrie de la pourpre. De fait, pour la grande majorité des commentateurs, Lydie a un statut social assez élevé (tout en faisant bien sûr partie, d’un point de vue romain, de la classe des *humiliores* et non des *honestiores*). Elle souligne deux fois que Lydia oblige Paul et les siens à demeurer chez elle et que cela était socialement choquant¹⁷. Bien qu’elle ait beaucoup écrit sur Lydie¹⁸, le parallèle avec Cléophas n’est pas développé. Les nombreuses publications féministes ulté-

¹⁵ Cf. STERCK-DEGUELDRÉ, *Eine Frau Namens Lydia*, 249. G. HOTZE, *Jesus als Gast. Studien zu einem christologischen Leitmotiv im Lukasevangelium* (Würzburg 2007).

¹⁶ Cf. L. MATSON, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts*. Pattern and Studies (London 1996) 148, 152.

¹⁷ Cf. L. SCHOTTROFF, *Let the Oppressed Go Free. Feminist Perspectives on the New Testament* (Louisville, KY 1993) 131-137: “Lydia: a new quality of Power”.

¹⁸ Elle a d’ailleurs donné le nom de Lydia à son grand ouvrage sur les femmes dans le christianisme primitif: L. SCHOTTROFF, *Lydia’s Impatient Sis-*

rieures mettent en valeur le rôle de Lydie, soulignent l'importance de sa maison comme centre missionnaire mais ne mentionnent presque jamais ce parallèle.

Un troisième champ de recherche porte sur la question de l'hospitalité (chez Luc ou dans le Nouveau Testament en général) ¹⁹. Dans une remarquable monographie récente sur ce thème (soulignant la façon dans Luc reprend les *topoi* antiques sur l'hospitalité), J. Jipp ne consacre que deux lignes à la question: "Lydia's 'pressing' Paul to receive her hospitality is reminiscent of the disciples who 'press' [Jesus] saying 'stay with us' (Lk 24,29a)" ²⁰. En revanche, il met bien en valeur l'importance du thème de l'hospitalité envers les étrangers dans la littérature grecque (à commencer par Homère). Ainsi Luc non seulement reprend un *topos* littéraire fort connu depuis Homère (la visite d'un Dieu ou d'un envoyé de Dieu accueilli comme un hôte ou pas) ²¹ mais s'appuie sur une valeur sociale profondément enracinée dans les sociétés antiques et notamment hellénistiques: l'hospitalité. J. Jipp ne relève pas en revanche que le verbe "contraindre" (παρabiάζομαι) est employé en Gn 19,9 lors de la "scène-type" où Lot cherche à sauver ses hôtes des xénophobes de Sodome. Gn 19,9 (car Gn 19,3 a le verbe καταbiάζομαι) est l'un des sept usages du verbe dans la LXX: avec 1 S 28,23 (les serviteurs de Saül le pressent d'accepter le pain de la devineresse d'En-Dor), 2 R 2,17 (les frères prophètes pressent Elisée de faire chercher Elie), 2 R 5,16 (Naaman presse Elisée d'accepter un ca-

ters. A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity (Louisville, KY 1995). Rien non plus chez Richard S. ASCOUGH, *Lydia. Paul's Cosmopolitan Hostess* (Collegeville, MN 2009).

¹⁹ Cf. G. HOTZE, *Jesus als Gast. Studien zu einem christologischen Leitmotiv in Lukasevangelium* (FzB 111, Würzburg 2007) 275: Celui-ci évoque en une ligne en note à propos d'Emmaüs le point de contact (Paul est "mit gleichem Vehemenz gedrängt") mais sa conclusion à propos de Lydie est différente: "In dieser Hinsicht ist sie vergleichbar mit Levi oder Zachäus aus dem Evangelien". De même, A. ARTERBURY, *Entertaininig Angels. Early Christian Hospitality in its Mediterranean Setting* (Sheffield 2005) 148, mentionne d'une ligne le parallèle sémantique.

²⁰ J.W. JIPP, *Divine Visitations and Hospitality to Strangers in Luke-Acts. An interpretation of the Malta Episode in Acts 28:1-10* (Leiden 2013) 243. Il ajoute *ibidem* que ce parallèle "suggests the continuation of the Lord's visit". En effet et cela mérite d'être creusé davantage.

²¹ Cf. JIPP, *Divine Visitations*, 81-88 pour la relecture de l'accueil d'Ulysse à Ithaque.

deau), et — sans que cela implique deux humains — Dt 1,43 (vous vous êtes convaincus de monter sur la montagne), Am 6,10 (ils s'efforceront de sortir les ossements) et Jon 1,13 (les marins s'efforcent de lutter contre la mer). Un voyageur digne de ce nom ne saurait accepter trop facilement une invitation. Il convient que son hôte insiste avec une certaine énergie pour qu'il veuille bien accepter l'offre de demeurer chez lui. La "violence" impliquée dans cet échange est une "douce violence", une insistance qui est (des deux côtés) liée au respect envers autrui. Si, chez les Grecs, nul ne sait si son hôte ne serait pas un dieu déguisé, chez les juifs, il s'agit de se souvenir qu'il pourrait s'agir d'un ange. L'auteur de la lettre aux Hébreux le rappelle pour inviter à pratiquer l'hospitalité: "N'oubliez pas l'hospitalité, car c'est grâce à elle que quelques-uns, à leur insu, hébergèrent des anges" (He 13,2; cf. aussi Rm 12,13). Sur la question de l'hospitalité, culture sémitique et culture hellénistique se rejoignent.

Du reste de nombreuses publications récentes préfèrent développer une comparaison entre l'épisode de Lydie et celui de Marthe et Marie (Lc 10,28-32)²². Dans le deuxième volume de son commentaire, le spécialiste des Actes Daniel Marguerat met également en rapport la mention du verbe παραβιάζομαι avec l'hospitalité: "Le verbe élégant παραβιάζομαι ne se lit dans le NT qu'ici et en Lc 24,29 (les pèlerins d'Emmaüs). Offrir l'hospitalité à un groupe d'hommes correspond au statut émancipé de la femme en milieu hellénistique; l'accueil de Jésus et son groupe par Marthe et Marie (Lc 10,38-42) correspond aux mœurs hellénistiques plutôt qu'aux usages juifs"²³. Les points de contacts entre l'accueil de Jésus par Marthe et l'accueil de Paul par Lydie sont clairs: dans les deux cas, une femme, apparemment maîtresse de maison (c'est d'ailleurs ce que signifie son nom: Marthe, maîtresse), accueille un envoyé de Dieu. Cependant il n'y pas de longs échanges préalables, et le verbe παραβιάζομαι n'apparaît pas. Le verbe employé, "accueillir" (ὑποδέχομαι), est le même que celui utilisé pour Zachée en Lc 19,6 (en Ac 17,7, Jason reçoit des évangélisateurs; en Ac 28,30, Paul reçoit des évangélisés). On peut conclure que les échos sont moins nets qu'avec la scène d'Emmaüs.

²² Cf., parmi d'autres, K. CORLEY, *Private Women, Public Meal. Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition* (Peabody, MA 1993) 143, et T.K. SEIM, *The Double Message. Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh 1994) 101.

²³ Je remercie vivement D. Marguerat de m'avoir permis de consulter son deuxième volume à paraître.

III. Le double parallèle

Si l'usage d'un verbe rare est déjà un réel point de rapprochement des deux textes selon la manière biblique, il y a plus, y compris au niveau sémantique. Il y a deux pôles qui se font écho: la séquence autour du fait de contraindre l'évangélisateur à entrer pour demeurer (entre Lc 24,29 et Ac 16,15) et celle autour de l'ouverture des yeux ou des oreilles en lien avec l'ouverture du cœur à l'occasion d'un échange de paroles (entre Lc 24,31-32 et Ac 16,14). Cependant d'autres analogies peuvent être relevées notamment pour ce qui est de la localisation de la rencontre (hors de la ville ou du village).

	Emmaüs - Cléophas	Philippes - Lydie
un long échange de paroles	Or, comme ils <u>conversaient</u> et <u>discutaient</u> ensemble, Jésus lui-même les rejoignit et fit route avec eux (Lc 24,15) ἐν τῷ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ συζητεῖν A	une fois assis, nous avons <u>parlé</u> aux femmes qui s'y trouvaient réunies (Ac 16,13b) ἐλαλοῦμεν A'
Avec la nomination d'un des évangélisés	L'un d'eux, <u>nommé</u> Cléophas... (Lc 24,18a) εἷς ὀνόματι Κλεοπάς B	L'une d'elles, <u>nommée</u> Lydie... (Ac 16,14a) τις γυνὴ ὀνόματι Λυδία B'
Hors de la ville ou du village	Ils approchèrent du village où ils se rendaient, et lui fit mine d'aller plus loin (Lc 24,28) C	Nous en avons franchi la porte, près d'une rivière... (Ac 16,13a) C'

Pour ces parallèles-là, l'ordre diffère. En suivant l'ordre de Luc 24 (ABC), nous avons en Actes 16 l'ordre C'A'B'. Pour la séquence suivante, la plus significative, nous avons l'ordre des éléments repris qui forme une *reversio* complète²⁴. En effet, à la séquence ABCD en Luc 24, correspond la séquence D'C'B'A' en Actes 16.

²⁴ Pour la figure de style de la *reversio*, cf. J.-A. ALETTI et alii (éd.), *Vocabulaire raisonné de l'exégèse biblique*. Les mots, les approches, les auteurs (Paris 2005) 98.

Une forte insistance ...	Et ils le <u>pressèrent</u> en disant ... (Lc 24,29a) καὶ παρεβιάσαντο αὐτὸν λέγοντες A	Et elle nous <u>pressa</u> ... (Ac 16,15c) καὶ παρεβιάσατο ἡμᾶς A'
Pour faire entrer et "demeurer"	"Demeure avec nous ..." (Lc 24,29b) μείνον μεθ' ἡμῶν, Et il entra pour <u>demeurer</u> avec eux (Lc 24,29c) καὶ εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μείναι σὺν αὐτοῖς B	elle nous invita en disant: "Puisque vous estimez que je crois au Seigneur, <u>entrez</u> dans ma maison et <u>demeurez-y</u> " (Ac 16,15b) εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου μένετε. B'
Une situation quasi sacramentelle	Or, quand il se fut mis à table avec eux, <u>il prit le pain, prononça la bénédiction, le rompit et le leur donna.</u> (Lc 24,30) C	<u>Lorsqu'elle eut été baptisée</u> , elle et sa maison (Ac 16,15a) C'
Une ouverture du cœur par l'écoute ou des yeux par le cœur ...	Alors leurs yeux furent <u>ouverts</u> et ils le <u>reconnurent</u> ... (Lc 24,31a) αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοιχθῆσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ Et ils se dirent l'un à l'autre: 'Notre <u>cœur</u> n'était-il pas tout brûlant en nous lorsqu'il nous <u>parlait</u> ' (Lc 24,32a) οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν D	Elle écoutait car le Seigneur avait <u>ouvert son cœur</u> ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν pour la rendre attentive aux <u>paroles</u> de Paul. (Ac 16,14b) τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου. D'

Les parallèles sont étroitement mêlés aux différences qui créent un heureux effet de *variatio*. Dans l'évangile, l'appel à demeurer précède le moment de l'ouverture des yeux: Cléophas et son compagnon ne savent pas que c'est Jésus au moment de leur demande ²⁵;

²⁵ C'est cet élément qui peut permettre de rapprocher ce récit du motif grec de l'accueil d'un Dieu incognito. Après O. WEINREICH, *Gebet und Wunder*. Zwei Abhandlungen zur Religions- und Literaturgeschichte (Stuttgart 1929) qui avait repéré la péripétie du tremblement de terre permettant de li-

dans les Actes, il suit le moment de l'ouverture du cœur. Dans l'évangile, le moment quasi sacramentel du partage du pain précède la naissance de la foi; dans les Actes, le temps du baptême la suit. Dans l'évangile, l'évangélisateur est seul et les évangélisés sont deux; dans les Actes, les évangélisateurs sont plusieurs et c'est une personne qui prend l'initiative de les accueillir (même si son lien à un groupe est doublement souligné: par la présence des autres femmes à la rivière et par la mention de sa maisonnée au moment du baptême). Dans le récit d'Emmaüs, les femmes sont physiquement absentes mais le rappel de leur témoignage de la résurrection se trouve au cœur du récit; en un certain sens, Jésus parle pour convaincre les disciples de la double nécessité de la Passion et de la Résurrection, ce qui implique le caractère véridique du témoignage des femmes que les disciples hommes doivent finir par accepter. Dans les Actes, les hommes semblent étonnamment absents du rassemblement de prière au bord de la rivière (le côté très surprenant de cette absence n'est d'ailleurs pas assez relevé). Au premier jour de la foi, le lendemain du shabbat, au matin de Pâques, ce sont des femmes qui furent les premières croyantes; au premier jour de l'arrivée des missionnaires en Europe, un jour de shabbat, ce sont des femmes qui sont les premières à accueillir le message de la foi.

bérer des prisonniers, c'est L. PORTEFAIX, *Sisters Rejoice*. Paul's Letter to the Philippians and Luke-Acts as Seen by First-Century Philippian Women (Stockholm 1988) 169-171, qui a mis en lumière les parallèles structurels entre Actes 16 et les Bacchantes d'Euripide. Sans que l'on puisse parler de dépendance littéraire, il y a de fortes ressemblances entre plusieurs épisodes. Selon J.B. WEAVER, *Plots of Epiphany*. Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles (BZNW 131; Berlin 2004) "Acts displays numerous similarities to ancient texts involving myths of Dionysius", 15. Cf. R. SEAFORD, "Thunder, lightning, and earthquake", *What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity* (ed. A.B. LLOYD) (London 1997) 139-148. D. MACDONALD, "Lydia and Her Sisters as Lukan Fictions", *A Feminist Companion to the Acts of the Apostles* (eds. A.-J. LEVINE – M. BLICKENSTAFF) (London 2004) 105-110, est plus affirmatif: "Insofar as every detail about Lydia in Acts points to her as a Christian Maenad, it would appear that by making the first convert in Europe a woman from Thyatira, named Lydia, a seller of purple garments, Luke broadcast the similarities between Paul's mission to Greece and that of Dionysus. The parallels between the Bacchae and Paul's adventures are intentional, indeed strategic", 110. Cf. J. SCHÄFER, "Zur Funktion der Dionysosmysterien in der Apostelgeschichte: Eine intertextuelle Betrachtung der Berufungs- und Befreiungserzählungen in der Apostelgeschichte und der Bakchen des Euripides", *TZ* 66 (2010) 199-222.

IV. Un réseau de renvois

Si les échos et renvois entre la scène d'Emmaüs et celle de Lydie sont frappants, il ne faudrait pas en déduire que la *synkrisis* entre les deux passages soit la seule que Luc ait voulu mettre en place. Les parallèles relevés par d'autres commentateurs ne sont pas le fruit du hasard. Luc, comme tout bon auteur antique, sait établir un jeu multiple de renvois. Beaucoup relèvent par exemple à juste titre que la scène de la libération du geôlier qui suit l'épisode de Lydie contient un certain nombre de points communs avec elle, notamment le fait qu'un homme accède à la foi (Ac 16,31), les reçoit dans sa maison et y est baptisé "avec toute sa maison" (Ac 16,32-33). Comme dans l'évangile, Luc aime faire se succéder un épisode concernant un homme par un passage analogue concernant une femme (ou vice-versa). De même, d'autres commentateurs relèvent les échos avec Actes 8 où Philippe baptise l'eunuque éthiopien. Dans les deux cas, la proximité d'une rivière et un long échange de paroles amènent au baptême d'un craignant-Dieu. De façon non surprenante, les échos entre la scène de l'eunuque et la rencontre d'Emmaüs ont depuis longtemps été remarqués²⁶. Ces deux scènes partagent notamment les thèmes de l'explication des Ecritures (autour des souffrances du Messie) et de la disparition subite de l'évangéliste (cf. Lc 24,31 et Ac 8,39). F.S. Spencer observe: "By so modeling the Emmaus-road- and Ethiopian-eunuch- incidents after a common pattern, Luke no doubt betrays his customary concern to correlate the experiences of the early church with the life and ministry of Jesus. But which experiences are particularly in view? One suggestion focuses upon the church's sensing of the living Christ's presence mediated through the study of the OT Scriptures and through the celebration of common meals and baptismal ceremonies. Another approach fixes on the importance of wandering evangelists (like Philip) in early Christian missions and the need for communities to show them hospitality, as if receiving Christ himself (like the Emmaus disciples)"²⁷. La dernière phrase corres-

²⁶ Cf. C. H. LINDIJER, "Two Creative Encounters in the Work of Luke. Luke xxiv 13-35 and Acts viii 26-40", *Miscellanea Neotestamentica* (eds. T. BAARDA et al.) (Leiden 1978) 77-85.

²⁷ Cf. F.S. SPENCER, *The Portrait of Philip in Acts. A Study of Roles and Relations* (Sheffield 1992) 142.

pond très bien à Actes 16 en remplaçant Philippe par Paul! Remarquons qu'il convient certes d'accueillir les évangélisateurs comme le Christ lui-même mais qu'il convient tout autant que ceux-ci ne s'attardent pas indûment en abusant de l'hospitalité qui leur est faite. Tant l'œuvre de Luc (cf. le discours de Paul en Actes 20) que la *Didaché* des Apôtres (qui lui est contemporaine) soulignent le désintéressement nécessaire de l'apôtre et le fait qu'il est prêt à travailler pour subvenir à ses besoins. La "disparition" subite de l'évangélisateur met en relief le fait qu'il ne s'attarde pas et court annoncer l'évangile de lieu en lieu. Luc tient ainsi les deux dimensions ensemble: la nécessité de l'accueil généreux de la part des évangélisés, qui souhaitent que l'envoyé demeure chez eux, et celle de la liberté de mouvement de l'envoyé, qui est toujours prompt à partir vers un autre lieu (cf. Ac 12,17b).

Dans la logique de l'accueil des non-juifs, certains ont voulu voir un parallèle entre Lydie et le centurion Corneille ²⁸. Corneille a été le premier non juif (en laissant le cas de l'eunuque à part puisque la chose n'est pas explicitement spécifiée) admis au baptême par Pierre et Lydie est la première européenne admise au baptême par Paul. La *synkrisis*, fondamentale pour le livre des Actes, entre Pierre et Paul en est renforcée. En d'autres termes, mettre en valeur les reprises de la scène d'Emmaüs avec le récit de Lydie, n'a pas pour objectif d'exclure d'autres échos. Avec cette manière d'écrire, "Luke is well within the tradition of Hellenistic (and we may add, Hebraic) historiography in his representation of patterns of recurrence", remarque J. Green ²⁹. Cependant l'emploi d'un verbe rare et d'une double série de reprises sémantiques crée un écho particulièrement notable dont la portée théologique doit être dégagée.

²⁸ Cf. S. MATTHEWS, *First Converts*. Rich Pagan Women and the Rhetoric of Mission in Early Judaism and Christianity (Stanford 2001) 88, qui souligne l'analogie entre Ac 16,15 et Ac 10,48 (le baptême est suivi de la requête de demeurer avec eux (τότε ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἐπιμεῖναι ἡμέρας τινάς). Cf. D.L. MATSON, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts*. Pattern and Interpretation (JSOTSupp 123; Sheffield 1996) 152. Pour lui, il faut noter le parallèle avec les 72 disciples en Lc 10,5-7, invités à demeurer dans les maisons.

²⁹ Cf. J. GREEN, "Internal Repetitions in Luke-Acts: Contemporary Narratology and Lucan Historiography", *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. B. WITHERINGTON) (Cambridge 1996) 283-299, 297.

V. Ce que nous dit le parallèle de la théologie lucanienne

Nous avons affaire non seulement à une analogie de situation mais également à une analogie théologique signifiante. Au niveau de la situation, nous avons, après une rencontre que l'on devine assez longue dans les deux cas, des acteurs d'une rencontre bilatérale qui demandent à ce que la partie qui parle demeure avec eux. Dans le cas de Jésus, il s'agit de Cléophas et de son compagnon (ceux qui ont le tort de ne pas croire les femmes de leur groupe). Dans le cas de Paul, il s'agit de Lydie et de ses compagnes. Dans les deux cas, la demande est faite sur la deuxième moitié du jour, en tout cas alors que le soleil baisse. Dans les deux cas, la demande est faite suite à un grand désir. Nulle violence, verbale ou physique, n'est à l'horizon mais bien plutôt l'ardente supplication, la persuasion motivée par une fascination, le désir d'entendre celui qui parle continuer à parler. Dans les deux cas, par ailleurs le contexte est sacramentel: les deux disciples d'Emmaüs s'apprentent à reconnaître Jésus lorsqu'il rompra le pain tandis que Lydie et "les siens" viennent d'être baptisés. Si l'on se souvient des parallèles nombreux entre le baptême de l'eunuque et la rencontre d'Emmaüs, le fait que Luc crée des points de contact entre scènes eucharistiques (ou à forte tonalité eucharistique) et scènes baptismales ne peut nous surprendre. L'enjeu n'est pas d'abord étroitement sacramentaire mais bien proprement ecclésiologique. Comment se construit l'Eglise? Comment le Christ ressuscité demeure présent à ses disciples? Si Luc poursuit plusieurs objectifs qui lui sont chers: souligner l'importance de la rencontre et de l'hospitalité — et de ce fait la solidarité des nantis envers les plus pauvres — relever le rôle actif des femmes dans l'accueil de la foi et le soutien de la mission, faire remarquer aux auditeurs cultivés combien l'annonce chrétienne dépasse les attentes des cultes dionysiens, son objectif principal demeure essentiellement théologique: montrer comment l'Esprit de Dieu continue à agir dans les cœurs, comment les apôtres marchent dans les pas du Ressuscité³⁰. L'avantage théologique de la *synkrisis* qu'effectue Luc entre les deux scènes lui permet de faire

³⁰ R. O'TOOLE "Parallels between Jesus and His Disciples in Luke-Acts: A Further Study", *BZ* 27 (1983) 195-212, conclut à juste titre: "A corollary of this continuity in Luke-Acts would be that the resurrected Christ remains active in Acts", 211.

comprendre la source de la joie éprouvée par Lydie : elle a bénéficié de l'explication des Ecritures donnée par Paul comme Cléophas et son compagnon avaient bénéficié de celle donnée par Jésus. De même, il n'est plus besoin de préciser de quelle nature sera le partage du pain qui suivra nécessairement l'hospitalité accordée. L'économie narrative accroît l'impact théologique.

Bien sûr, un lecteur pourra être davantage sensible aux réelles différences entre l'ample récit sur la route du village d'Emmaüs et la brève scène aux abords de Philippes, "ville principale du district de Macédoine et colonie romaine" (Ac 16,12b). L'épisode d'Emmaüs est le bouquet final de l'évangile tandis que nous sommes ici au milieu du livre des Actes. La première scène est comme un feu d'artifices où Luc déploie tout son art littéraire et théologique tandis que la seconde est une péripétie peu flamboyante, discrète, au milieu des voyages missionnaires de Paul. Dans l'évangile, les deux compagnons parlent de concert (même si nous ne connaissons le nom que de l'un d'eux) tandis que dans les Actes, une seule femme parle (ses compagnes ne l'ont, apparemment, pas suivie dans la foi) mais elle entraîne aussi les gens de sa maison. Dans un cas, l'on se trouve peu avant le geste quasi sacramentel de la fraction du pain, dans l'autre juste après le geste sacramentel du baptême. Sur la route se trouve le lieu du pain de la route. Près de l'eau (fleuve), surgit l'eau du baptême. La mention du fleuve (ποταμός; mot rare chez Luc qui ne se trouve qu'en Lc 6,48-49) est d'autant plus significative que les archéologues se demandent bien laquelle des trois petites rivières se trouvant dans les environs de Philippes serait la bonne. Aucune ne s'impose. Mais il fallait bien de l'eau pour un baptême immédiat. Si la rencontre d'Emmaüs est essentiellement eucharistique dans ses connotations, celle de Lydie est davantage baptismale. Dans le premier cas, les deux disciples ne sont pas chez eux tandis que Lydie désire recevoir chez elle. Certes, mais précisément ses différences contribuent à l'effet de *variatio*³¹, au plaisir de la lecture, où les écarts nous permettent d'apprécier d'autant mieux les parallèles. La bonne nouvelle a beaucoup à voir avec le fait de pénétrer dans la demeure d'autrui, à son invitation et afin de partager avec lui non seulement le pain de la parole mais aussi celui de l'hospitalité. Nous trouvons une insistance analogue lorsque

³¹ La *reversio* repérée plus haut s'inscrit également bien dans cet effet de *variatio* littéraire.

Pierre passe le seuil de la maison de Corneille. Tout en parlant, ils entrent dans la maison: "Et, tout en conversant avec lui, il [Pierre] entra" (Ac 10,27a). Là aussi le contexte est baptismal mais touche également au repas. Annoncer l'évangile signifie être prêt à se faire l'hôte de ceux auxquels il est annoncé. Dans cette hospitalité, c'est déjà l'accueil de tous les frères autour de la table eucharistique qui est préfiguré. La théologie de l'hospitalité est une théologie de la rencontre ³². Luc met ainsi en valeur l'aspect concret et fraternel de la communion créée par le Christ et poursuivie par ses Apôtres. Le théologien C. Theobald souligne à juste titre l'importance de la *synkrisis* à cet effet: "On découvre alors que cette 'technique littéraire' du parallélisme, appelée aussi '*synkrisis*', est omniprésente dans les deux textes de Luc: elle ne met pas seulement en rapport de ressemblance et de différence les grandes figures de l'église primitive comme Pierre et Paul mais aussi et surtout les disciples et Jésus lui-même [...] On voit dès lors apparaître le sens théologique de ce procédé littéraire et la raison structurelle pour laquelle Luc ajoute à son évangile un deuxième livre". Il poursuit en précisant la portée de cet élément théologique majeur: "Il y a une sorte de simultanéité à rétablir entre l'Absent de l'histoire, Jésus et son itinéraire, d'un côté, et ses témoins de l'autre" ³³.

* *

*

Sur le plan formel, l'observation du parallèle nous invite à être attentifs à la façon dont Luc reprend des termes rares pour créer des échos entre les deux parties de son œuvre. Il attire notre attention sur le réseau de relations que de nombreux passages ont les uns avec les autres en évitant les exclusives. Sur le plan théologique, cette observation nous conduit à admirer encore davantage le souci inclusif de Luc, qui met ainsi en valeur un homme et une femme, un juif et une païenne, un judéen et une asiate devenue européenne, un témoin du Ressuscité et une interlocutrice de Paul, Cléophas et Lydie: tous deux ont un nom et tous deux méritent

³² Cf. notamment B. STANDAERT "Luc, maître narrateur de la rencontre", *Raconter, interpréter, annoncer* (eds. E. STEFFEK et al.) (Genève 2003) 282-295.

³³ Cf. C. THEOBALD, *Présences d'évangile II*. Lire l'Evangile de Luc et les Actes des apôtres en Creuse et ailleurs (Paris 2011) 68, 69.

d'être loués. La pointe théologique semble limpide: le fait de rencontrer un apôtre témoin du Christ et de l'évangile suscite une joie intérieure et un désir de le retenir qui est de même nature que celui que les premiers disciples ont éprouvé à rencontrer Jésus ressuscité. On rejoint ici tout à fait le sens profond du parallèle entre la scène d'Emmaüs et celle de l'eunuque éthiopien. Là rencontrer Philippe dans un cadre baptismal était analogue au fait de rencontrer Jésus dans un cadre eucharistique. Le clin d'œil sémantique le plus appuyé était dans cette séquence celui des yeux qui s'ouvrent. Avec Paul et Lydie, il s'agit de la douce contrainte que la foi nous fait éprouver à rester en contact avec ceux qui sont pour nous les messagers de l'évangile, les porteurs de la grâce. L'esprit du Christ continue de souffler, la joie de la rencontre continue à être possible. Paul, comme Philippe avant lui, permet à juifs et grecs de faire la rencontre de la grâce. Pour mieux honorer cet élément majeur du projet théologique lucanien, il serait bon que les futurs commentateurs signalent — et que les traductions ne laissent pas échapper! — cet écho qui témoigne discrètement du feu de l'Esprit.

Centre Sèvres
Facultés Jésuites de Paris
35bis rue de Sèvres
F-75006 Paris

Marc RASTOIN

SUMMARY

The literary device of the *synkrisis*, the methodological comparison between two persons or situations, is regularly used in Luke's work, in particular to create links between the Gospel and Acts. A particular *synkrisis* unites the Emmaus episode (Lk 21,13-33) and the meeting between Paul and Lydia (Acts 16,5-11). In both narratives, the rare verb *παραβιάζομαι* is employed and, while this has been pointed out by commentators, the theological value of this *synkrisis* has nevertheless been underestimated. Luke had a deeply theologically inclusive agenda, and the parallels between Cleophas, the Jewish man who meets the Risen One, and Lydia, the pagan woman who meets Paul the Apostle, illustrate this.

The Redemptive Inversions of Jeremiah in Romans 9–11

Paul's explicit dependence in Romans 9–11 on Isaiah is well known. Isaiah is Paul's favorite source for the explicit quotations from the prophets¹. However, especially in this section of Romans where Paul is wrestling with the question of whether or not God's word concerning Israel has failed, more is going on with the scriptures than simply explicit quotation. Romans chapters 9–11 attempts to reconfigure the inherited scriptures in order to make sense of a moment in which the Jews do not seem to be following the message that will lead to the culmination of Israel's role as a nation of priests for the world. Thus, in Rom 10,6-10 we observe a Christological gloss over Deut 30,12-14. Rom 9,24-26 plays with Hosea so that a prophecy once referring to a rejected Israel coming back to its spiritual inheritance signifies how foreign nations will become Israel. Hays has referred to Paul's images for Israel in Romans 9 as "scandalous inversions", in which Israel is placed into the roles of Ishmael, Esau and Pharaoh². Less noticed but just as crucial for our understanding are the "redemptive inversions" that Romans 9–11 makes of Jeremiah's language regarding Israel. This reconfiguring of scripture by inversion must be carefully tracked, for recognition of the dissonant intertextuality that emerges between Romans 9–11 and Jeremiah sharpens the overall effect of this central section of Romans. Romans 9–11 inverts Jeremiah to emphasize God's redemption of Israel: Paul asks Jeremiah's question about God's faithfulness and salvation for Israel, specifically raised in the first twenty chapters of Jeremiah. The text of Romans 9–11 goes on to invert Jeremiah's response by including a prayer for Israel's salvation and a picture of Israel as a cultivated olive tree

¹ See especially F. WILK, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus* (FRLANT 179; Göttingen 1998) and J. R. WAGNER, *Heralds of the Good News*. Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans (NTSupp 101; Leiden 2002).

² R. B. HAYS, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT 1989) 67.

whose excised branches will be grafted in again, because God's word toward Israel has not failed.

By "dissonant intertextuality", I mean what Sommer means by "reversal". Dissonant intertextuality is the use a text makes of an antecedent text in a way that contradicts, reverses, or shifts the focus of meaning of the antecedent text in order to fit a recognizably distinct agenda in the borrowing text ³.

Before we begin the comparisons that highlight the dissonant intertextuality between Romans 9–11 and Jeremiah 1–20, it might be useful to note that this section of Jeremiah figures elsewhere in the Pauline corpus. Thus G. R. O'Day, following Fishbane's presentation of inner biblical exegesis as response to a crisis, has shown against the dominant reading of 1 Cor 1,26–31 how that text uses Jer 9,22–23 to argue that the Corinthians' wise, strong, and rich status is not what they should glory in, but rather that these Corinthians should glory in the cross ⁴. In that case only the object of the implied audience's boasting is changed. Jeremiah's audience is to glory that they know God; Paul asks his Corinthian audience to glory in Christ Jesus. The boasting text of Jer 9,24 that Paul quotes in 1 Cor 1,31 and 2 Cor 10,17 also lies behind the boasting Paul describes in Rom 5,2.11.

More recently and closer to our passage, T. Berkley has argued that Paul uses Jeremiah chapters 7 and 9 in Romans 2 ⁵. As Paul did in 1 Corinthians, Paul adjusts or inverts Jeremiah to express a point for his Roman audience: Jeremiah says that "all the house of Israel is uncircumcised in heart", just like the Gentiles who practice circumcision. Paul applies this in a straightforward way to the boasting Jewish interlocuter of 2,25. Then Paul sharpens Jeremiah's criticism by stating in Rom 2,26 that uncircumcised Gentiles who follow God's decrees will be considered circumcised in heart ⁶. Even D.-A. Koch, who argues against any direct quotations of Jeremiah

³ B. SOMMER, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*. Allusion in Isaiah 40–66 (Stanford, CA 1988) 36–46.

⁴ G. R. O'DAY, "Jeremiah 9:22–23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26–31: A Study in Intertextuality", *JBL* 109 (1990) 265–266.

⁵ T. W. BERKLEY, *From a Broken Covenant to a Circumcised Heart*. Pauline Intertextual Exegesis in Romans 2:17–29 (SBLDS 175; Atlanta, GA 2000) 82–90.

⁶ Berkley suggests that Paul can make this move, assigning the status of circumcised to uncircumcised people, based on a reinterpretation of Genesis 17,

in the Pauline corpus and only recognizes citations from Isaiah, the twelve prophets, and Psalms in Romans 9–11, grants that Jeremiah would thoroughly fit Paul's concerns ⁷.

Now that we are about to examine evidence for inversions of Jeremiah in Romans 9–11, I must answer a possible objection. Someone may well ask me: "How can you, whoever you are who reads Romans, claim to know what Paul was thinking? How can you know what was in Paul's mind; how can you judge Paul to be intentionally avoiding quotations of Jeremiah while inverting Jeremiah's categories?" My response is first to concede that I cannot prove Paul's intentions ⁸. For example, it is impossible to decide if Augustine's complete omission of any reference to Donatism, the hottest controversy in which he was embroiled while writing the *Confessions*, is intentional or not. Here as well, I am carefully avoiding any claim regarding Paul's intentions. But when the first scroll of Jeremiah is aligned with Romans 9–11, there are conceptual and literary clues that point to a relationship of dissonant intertextuality, though no quotations are made. Paul may not be consciously inverting Jeremiah, but when his chapters on the salvation of Israel here in the middle of Romans are read alongside Jeremiah's early, negative oracles regarding Israel's redemption, there is significant evidence for intertextual inversion. The thesis of this article is that Romans 9–11 inverts Jeremiah 1–20 while singing "in concert" with Isaiah 40–55, resulting in an inversion similar to what happens in Jeremiah's own book of comfort ⁹.

in which Abraham moves from uncircumcised to circumcised by actually undergoing the prescribed rite (ibid. 147). Cf. also Jer 4,4.

⁷ D.-A. KOCH, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus (BHT 69; Tübingen 1986) 45–46 and 46 n. 9.

⁸ See H. G. M. WILLIAMSON's ("Isaiah 62:4 and the Problem of Inner-Biblical Allusions", *JBL* 119 [2000] 739) concluding comment in an article in which he questions B. Halpern's claim that Isaiah 62,4 is alluding to Jeremiah: "In the case of inner-biblical allusions, as opposed to full citations, it will never be possible finally to prove that a writer was consciously dependent on one source rather than another, especially when much of the vocabulary to which appeal is made is relatively common".

⁹ Cf. WAGNER, *Heralds of the Good News*, and see W. L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 2. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26–52* (Minneapolis, MN 1989) 148–201 on "this fresh scroll of hope" (201).

I. Dissonant Intertextuality between Jeremiah and Romans 9–11

First, the driving question in Romans 9–11 regarding the trustworthiness of God is more similar to what drives the early chapters of Jeremiah than it is to Isaiah ¹⁰. In Jer 4,10, the prophet claims that God's word has deceived Israel. Paul asserts that God's word has not failed (Rom 9,6a) ¹¹. While there is no verbal parallel here, if one had to choose between Isaiah and Jeremiah when identifying a canonical background for the intense questions of Romans 9–11, Jeremiah would be the choice. Romans 9–11 plumbs the depths of God's abandonment of Israel, a prophetic *topos* more characteristic of Jeremiah than of Isaiah.

Second, three times in this section of Jeremiah, God commands the prophet not to pray for his people (Jer 7,16; 11,14; 14,11–12), a prohibition that seems based on a rejection of Israel ¹². In the third of these references, Jer 14,11–12, God replies to Jeremiah's prayer for the Lord's salvation with not only a prohibition against praying for Israel, since he would not hear such a prayer, but also a prediction that he will cut them off by sword, famine and death, specters whose danger Paul has already explicitly denied for those who love God (Rom 8,35.38). But the prohibitions against prayer that seem more directly inverted in Romans are Jer 7,16 and 11,14. Both these prohibitions of the prophet's prayer for his people are followed by descriptions of the futility of the sacrificial cult, a religious practice possibly alluded to in the mixed criticism — "I testify about them that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge" ¹³. Jer 11,14 is linked to Rom 10,1 by the catchword *δέησις*. After the divine oracle's rhetorical questions against Judah's zeal in the next

¹⁰ On the parallels between Paul as prophetic figure in Galatians with Jeremiah, see S. EASTMAN, *Recovering Paul's Mother Tongue*. Language and Theology in Galatians (Grand Rapids, MI 2007) 63–84.

¹¹ LXX Jer 4:10 is καὶ εἶπα ὁ δέσποτα κύριε, ἄρα γε ἀπατῶν ἡπάτησας; This verse has already been linked to Romans by C. BRYAN, *A Preface to Romans*. Notes on the Epistle in Its Literary and Cultural Setting (New York 2000) 159.

¹² The references for these three prohibitions against praying are the same between the MT and the LXX. Cf. Dmitri's remark to Alyosha, "Don't pray for me, I'm not worth it" in F. DOSTOYEVSKY, *The Brothers Karamazov* (trans. C. Garnett; New York 1957) 150.

¹³ Rom 10,2; cf. Jer 7,16.21; 11,14–15.

verse, “Can vows and holy meat ward off evils from you? Or will you escape from these?”, we find Jeremiah’s description of Israel as an olive tree, which we shall consider below. Besides the emphatic insistence that Paul is praying for his people’s salvation at Rom 10,1, we may also note that the beginning and ending of this section on Israel contain prayer language related to the place of Israel in the divine economy ¹⁴.

Third, against Jeremiah’s word (Jer 7,29) that God has *rejected* his people — ἀπεδοκίμασεν κύριος καὶ ἀπόσαστο τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ποιοῦσαν ταῦτα, the same verb appears in Rom 11,1 to assert that God has *not* rejected them — Λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἀπόσαστο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; μὴ γένοιτο ¹⁵. The catchword “reject” is found in exactly the same inflection in both texts, ἀπόσαστο.

Fourth, against Jeremiah’s word that his people will fall (Jer 6,15b) — διὰ τοῦτο πεσοῦνται ἐν τῇ πτώσει αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν ἀπολοῦνται, εἶπεν κύριος, Rom 11,11 asserts that the chosen people have not stumbled so as to fall — Λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν; μὴ γένοιτο. ¹⁶ Verbal links are the catchwords πίπτω (“fall”) and πταίω (“stumble”) that are found in both texts. While I am not arguing for Paul’s conscious, intentional inversion of these Jeremiah texts, it may be noted here that Rom 11,11, which uses these two key words from Jer 6,15b while contradicting that text, begins its question with “I say, then” (λέγω οὖν). Perhaps this is marking an inversion from a previous text, as if the Romans text is signaling “In contrast to Jeremiah, I say then ...” ¹⁷.

Fifth, Rom 11,16-17 juxtaposes two metaphors for God’s people — the first fruits section of a lump of dough, then an olive tree with roots and branches. Most Romans commentators find nothing in Paul’s scriptures behind his unexpected assertion that if the first

¹⁴ Rom 9,3 (cf. Exod 32,32); 11,33-36.

¹⁵ Jer 7,29b (see also Lam 5,22); Rom 11,1.

¹⁶ Cf. also Jer 8,4 — Ὅτι τάδε λέγει κύριος Μὴ ὁ πίπτων οὐκ ἀνίσταται; — with Rom 11,11. Origen has already noticed the connection between Jer 8,4 and Rom 11,11 in his commentary (8.8.30-32; ed. C. Hammond Bammel 682).

¹⁷ Paul may be tapping into the introductory prophetic *topos* of the prophets, “It shall no more be said ... , but ...” (Isa 47,5; 62,4; Jer 3,16; 7,32; 16,14; 19,6; 23,7; 31,29).

fruits are holy then the whole lump becomes holy¹⁸. But in Jer 2,3, Israel is called the Lord's first fruits in a divine oracle. Then in what M. Fishbane has argued is a shift to the prophetic voice, these holy first fruits are described as being eaten, bringing guilt upon those who consume them. Fishbane shows how this text in Jeremiah is a reworking of Lev 22,14-16, a prohibition against laypeople consuming food consecrated by being offered to the priests¹⁹. The connection between Jeremiah and Romans are the catchwords ἅγιος, ἀρχὴ γεννημάτων in Jeremiah and ἀπαρχή in Romans, and a conceptual link of comprehensive inclusion, signaled by πάντες οἱ ἔσθοντες and πᾶσα πατριὰ οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ in Jer 2,3-4 and the φύραμα in Rom 11,16. Instead of Jeremiah's emphasis on the guilt of those who have eaten Israel, which Fishbane takes to be a reference to the military destruction of Israel by her enemies²⁰, or the waywardness of Israel, including her priests and teachers of the law, that follows in Jer 2,5-8, Jeremiah's metaphor is inverted to say that the first fruits make the whole lump holy. It is as if the Romans text disagrees with Jeremiah's exegesis of Lev 22,14-16. Jeremiah uses the priestly text to describe the guilt of those who consume Israel, guilt arising from the contaminating, "holy" char-

¹⁸ M. HARTUNG, "Die kultische bzw. agrartechnisch-biologische Logik der Gleichnisse von der Teighebe und vom Ölbaum in Röm 11,16-24 und die sich daraus ergebenden theologischen Konsequenzen", *NTS* 45 (1999) 129-130, and C.E.B. CRANFIELD, *The Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh 1979) 563, offer no scriptural antecedents beyond the general priestly rules of the first fruits found in Num 15,17-21 and Lev 19,23-25. Hartung also mentions 1 Cor 7,12-16 as exemplifying the principle of sanctification Paul offers in Rom 11,16a ("Die kultische bzw. agrartechnisch-biologische Logik" 130). D.E. AUNE, "Distinct Lexical Meanings of ΑΠΑΡΧΗ in Hellenism, Judaism and Early Christianity", *Early Christianity and Classical Culture. Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (eds. J.T. FITZGERALD – T.H. OLBRICHT – L.M. WHITE) (NTSup 110; Leiden 2005) 121-122, notes the connection between Rom 11,16 and Num 15,20-21, but misses the possibility that Paul is inverting Jeremiah's use of first fruits in Jer 2,3.

¹⁹ M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 300-304. I am indebted to J. Kaminsky for this reference.

²⁰ M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 302. W. L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25* (Philadelphia, PA 1986) 85, also sees "military conquest" behind "eat" here. Holladay's connection of this text in Jeremiah to a similar use of first fruits in Hos 9,10 helps us see another first fruits text that Paul is inverting (ibid. 84).

acter of first fruits when wrongly consumed. But Paul focuses on the sanctifying power of the first fruits themselves. The holiness that inheres in the first fruits, which brings guilt to erring consumers in both Leviticus and Jeremiah, is viewed by Paul as potent to bring holiness to the whole batch of food from which the first fruits sample is taken. Holiness transferred to erring consumers who then become guilty is inverted in Romans 11,16 to holiness that passes from the first fruits to the whole lump from which the first fruits are taken, with no mention of guilt ²¹. The possibility that Romans is performing an inverse allusion to Jeremiah is made more probable when one notices that the next image in Romans 11, the cultivated olive tree, is an allusion to the olive tree of Jeremiah 11 that gets burned up and possibly also echoes the description of Israel as a wild vine in Jeremiah 2.

Sixth, against Jeremiah's word that his people have become an olive tree that God will burn up, making its branches useless (Jer 11,16), Rom 11,17.23-24 assert that Israel is a cultivated olive tree whose excised branches will be readily grafted in again ²². Jeremiah's use of the olive tree is based on Hos 14,7, a prophet that Paul also quotes in this section of Romans. While Rom 11,17-24 may simply be based on Hos 14,7, it is just as likely, in view of the connections between Romans 9–11 and Jeremiah 1–20 mentioned above, that the olive tree metaphor in Romans 11 is inverting Jer 11,16. This inversion might be prompted by Hos 14,7, which is a more positive picture of Israel as an olive tree than that offered in Jer 11,16. LXX Hos 14,7 begins by describing Israel's growing branches: πορεύσονται οἱ κλάδοι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται ὡς ἐλαία κατὰ καρπὸς... This would help to explain why the metaphor in Romans 11,16.24 draws attention to the holy and natural branches of a cultivated (more fruitful) olive tree. This is also the place to acknowledge that

²¹ Holladay's (*Jeremiah 1*, 84-85) suggestion that Jer 2,3 matches his own emendation of Amos 6,1, in which those of Zion are "the pick of the first (fruits) of the nations, the cream of the crop of the house of Israel" is especially attractive for understanding how Paul may be playing with the *topos* of Israel as first fruits. While he wants to retain the language of first fruits for Israel (Rom 11,16), the realities of his missionary efforts lead him to suggest that the nations come in first, then the Jews (Rom 11,25-26).

²² This connection has already been observed by A. T. HANSON, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London 1974) 121-124, who suggests that Rom 11,17-24 offers a midrash on Jer 11,16-19.

the olive tree metaphor in Romans 11 represents another sort of inversion besides the literary reversal with the early chapters of Jeremiah. The Romans 11 portrait of the cultivated olive tree that receives wild branches grafted into it “subverts the prevailing practice among olive cultivators”, as Esler has shown so well ²³.

Before presenting the verbal parallels in the olive tree intertextuality proposed as the sixth connection between Jeremiah and Romans 9–11, I offer two possibilities that are best grouped with the olive tree complex of intertextual links: Jeremiah’s picture of a *foreign* vine that turns to *bitterness* (Jer 2,21). There are no catchwords between the description of Israel as a vine that has gone awry, becoming a foreign or wild vine in Jer 2,21 and Romans 11. However, the description of this vine as foreign — נכריה in MT; ἄμπελος ἡ ἄλλοτρία in LXX — seems to be explicitly switched in Romans 11. For the olive tree metaphor in Romans 11 repeatedly emphasizes that the branches that have been cut off from the cultivated olive tree still retain their identity as belonging to that cultivated tree *by nature* (κατὰ φύσιν in 11,21 and οὗτοι οἱ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκεντρισθήσονται τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ in 11,24). Jer 2,21 exclaims how the choice vine has turned to bitterness — πῶς ἐστράφη εἰς πικρίαν. The word πιότης in Romans 11,17 may be a reaction to πικρία. In his discussion of the “reversals” that Deutero-Isaiah makes of Jeremiah, B. Sommer notes that often there is a common word both texts share. He also notes a case in which similar sounding words function as the catchword for such reversals; מִקְרִים in Isa 54,2 picks up מִקְרִים in Jer 10,20 ²⁴. It is possible that the reworking of Jeremiah’s olive tree metaphor in Romans 11 includes an alliterative move from Jeremiah’s “bitterness”, πικρία in LXX Jer 2,21, to the “fatness”, πιότης, in Rom 11,17 ²⁵.

The clear catchwords in the association of Jeremiah’s olive tree in Jeremiah 11 and Paul’s olive trees in Romans 11 are the feminine ἐλαία (Jer 11,16; Rom 11,17.24) and the plural κλάδοι (Jer 11,16; Rom 11,16.19.21). Just as we saw an inversion of the foreign vine to the olive branches that continue to belong to the cultivated olive

²³ P. F. ESLER, “Ancient Oleiculture and Ethnic Differentiation: The Meaning of the Olive-Tree Image in Romans 11”, *JSNT* 26 (2003) 103–124; quotation from 123.

²⁴ SOMMER, *A Prophet Reads Scripture* 39.

²⁵ LXX Jer 15,17 also has πικρία.

tree when comparing Jer 2:21 with Romans 11, so here we see an inversion between the branches that are useless and get burned up in Jer 11,16 and the branches that continue to be the branches that belong by nature to the tree that can easily be grafted back into it (Rom 11,24).

Seventh, in more consonant intertextuality with Jeremiah, there is a claim in Rom 11,32 that God has shut up all to disobedience that he might have mercy on all. We have already seen how God tells Jeremiah not to pray for mercy on the Jewish people (Jer 7,16; 11,14; 14,11-12), a prohibition Paul emphatically breaks (Rom 10,1). But in the restoration oracle of Jer 12,15-17, God promises to have mercy on his people's Gentile neighbors, provided they learn the ways of God's people and swear by God's name²⁶. Jeremiah's paragraph concludes by threatening total destruction on those among the nations who will not listen to God (Jer 12,17), a threat that is softened to the brief warning that unfaithful Gentiles can easily be cut off from the tree on to which they were grafted (Rom 11,22). The olive tree metaphor in Romans 11 seems to invert Jeremiah's own bleak portraits of divine judgment on Israel and the nations in this section of the prophet and agree more with the hopeful whisper that is audible in this section. Indeed, this restoration oracle of Jer 12,14-17 places God's people in some form of parity with the Gentiles, a relationship that Romans affirms while still asserting the Jewish people's advantages²⁷. With regard to the idea of showing mercy, then, traced through the word ἐλεέω, Romans 9-11 inverts Jeremiah's warnings against the Jewish people on the way to ending at a place very near to Jeremiah's promise of universal restoration held in tension with warning against unfaithfulness to the God of Israel.

While all these connections are not equally compelling, there is enough going on between Jeremiah 1-20 and Romans 9-11 to argue that W. D. Davies is wrong in rejecting Paul's use of Jer 11,16 in Romans 11. Davies's instincts are right that the olive tree metaphor is addressing anti-Semitism and showing that ethnic Jews do have an advantageous position over unfruitful Gentiles, but his rejection of Jer 11,16 is possibly flawed by a tacit assumption that

²⁶ HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1*, 391: "This passage offers an astonishing message of 'universal' restoration".

²⁷ See Rom 2,11; 3,1-2.29-30; 11,28-32.

Paul always employs images and terms from his scriptures to score the same points they do in their original contexts. The link to a Synagogue of the Olive in Rome that Davies also rejects may also be at work here, as well as a correction of Gentile pride by describing the Gentile olive branches as wild and hence unfruitful²⁸. My study of the relationship between Jeremiah 1–20 and Romans 9–11 does not silence the other echoes that exegetes have heard resonating in Paul's olive tree metaphor. Indeed, given the way that Paul transforms the peace propaganda of imperial Rome in this letter, the olive branch's signification of peace should not be overlooked²⁹. My argument in this article is that in Romans 9–11 some dissonant intertextuality is definitely happening in relation to Jeremiah 1–20. This thesis includes a claim that the olive tree metaphor in Rom 11,17–24 must be read alongside the olive tree metaphor of Jer 11,16.

II. The Anxiety of Influence

Verbatim quotations are one of the few ways one could argue for intentional inversion, or the conscious outworking of an anxiety of influence. In most of Romans 9–11 Paul does not quote from Jeremiah in this way, and in any event I am not identifying and cannot prove that the seven, mostly dissonant connections listed above between Jeremiah 1–20 and Romans 9–11 are conscious, intentional inversions. Still, we must ask what is going on between the

²⁸ W.D. DAVIES, "Paul and the Gentiles: A Suggestion concerning Romans 11:13–24", *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (ed. W.D. DAVIES) (Philadelphia, PA 1984) 158–161; "In Jer 11:16–17 the olive becomes an object of the divine judgment — a motif alien to Paul's purpose in Rom 11:17" (159). P. LAMPE (*From Paul to Valentinus. Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* [trans. M. Steinhauser; ed. M. D. JOHNSON; Minneapolis, MN 2003] 431 n. 10) offers CIG 9904; CIJ 1:281; 509 as evidence for a συναγωγή Ἐλαίας in Rome.

²⁹ On peace as a *theologoumenon* in Romans see K. HAACKER, "Der Römerbrief als Friedensmemorandum", *NTS* 36 (1990) 25–41; idem, *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Cambridge 2003) 45–53; as a transformation of imperial peace propaganda, *ibid.* 116–19. On the olive branch as a sign of peace, see M. KOZAKIEWICZ, "Appendix: The Headgear of the Female Statue", *Subject and Ruler. The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity* (ed. A. SMALL) (Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement Series 17; Ann Arbor, MI 1996) 137, and Octavian's coins in *Roman Imperial Coinage* I, 59 no. 252 pl. 5 and no. 253.

text of Jeremiah and the text of Romans. Those in the field of literature are sometimes more alert to this sort of dissonant intertextuality than we students of the New Testament are, who tend to look for quotations or positive allusions when we attempt to retrace Paul's exegesis. Purists among my readers have my permission to cringe at the following examples. Though their contexts are far removed from the New Testament's use of the Old Testament, I offer the following examples of the anxiety of influence, just so we can be more alert to it within the Christian canon of scripture. The "sacred parody" of the 17th century British poets, especially George Herbert, took secular conventions and inverted them or adapted them for sacred purposes. Jane Austen's "Northanger Abbey" parodies Gothic romance by making fun of characters' imaginations (such as they would be shown in Gothic romances) as she moves toward more realistic fiction. Similar phenomena occur in other genres: the impressionist Debussy quotes Wagner the romanticist and then introduces laughing sounds to show his rejection of such musical phrasing ³⁰.

Harold Bloom's "The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry" suggests five ways in which authors display dissonant intertextuality in relation to antecedent texts. In his discussion of one of these ways, what Bloom calls "Daemonization or The Counter-Sublime", he writes, "So many songs of triumph, read close, begin to appear rituals of separation, that a wary reader may wonder if the truly strong poet ever has any antagonist beyond the self and its strongest precursor" ³¹. Is there a sense in which Jeremiah is a strong, or the "strongest precursor" for Paul, against whom Paul is asserting his independence?

I will not allow my argument to rest on the *personae* of Paul and Jeremiah to explain the anxiety of influence Paul perhaps experienced regarding Jeremiah. But the biographical contours of these two messengers to the nations are remarkably similar ³². Paul, a member of the tribe of Benjamin (Rom 11,1), designated apostle

³⁰ DEBUSSY, "Golliwogg's Cakewalk" (a movement from *Children's Corner*) quoting from WAGNER, *Tristan und Isolde*.

³¹ H. BLOOM, *The Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry* (London 1973) 110.

³² With special attention to Galatians, EASTMAN (*Recovering Paul's Mother Tongue*, 67-68, 76-84) highlights similarities in prophetic call, self-presentation and suffering that Paul shares with Jeremiah.

to the nations from his mother's womb, would find it dangerous en route to Jerusalem to cite Jeremiah the member of Benjamin who is designated prophet to the nations from his mother's womb, for Jeremiah is the prophet with connections to the house of Eli and Abiathar who relativizes the Jerusalem temple by equating it with the tabernacle at Shiloh³³. Paul is anxious for a better reception in Jerusalem than Jeremiah received³⁴. But these connections, tempting as they are within psychological analysis, have no place in an argument that is simply finding some dissonant intertextuality between Jeremiah 1–20 and Romans 9–11 while making no claim regarding Paul's intentions. Let us return to the literary comparison of Romans 9–11 with the opening chapters of Jeremiah.

III. Intertextuality That Avoids Quotation

We can fill out our understanding of the relationship between Romans 9–11 and these opening chapters of Jeremiah by returning to B. Sommer's work on intertextuality between Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah. Sommer's identification of "reversals" that Deutero-Isaiah employs seems to be the most helpful analogy for what is going on here between the text of Romans 9–11 and Jeremiah. Sommer documents how Deutero-Isaiah uses material from Jeremiah, including material from chapter 2 and chapter 10. These chapters are in the same section of Jeremiah that I am suggesting Romans 9–11 redemptively inverts³⁵. Sommer argues that Deutero-Isaiah, even with these reversals, "reinforces Jeremiah's position as a prophet, because in repeating Jeremiah's words in the form proper for his own day he brings them new validity"³⁶. One example he offers is the use of language from Jeremiah's letter to the exiles in Babylon, telling them to settle, build houses and plant gardens in Babylon (Jer 29,4-6), which Isaiah 65 then inverts by using the same language for what will happen in Jerusalem (Isa 65,18-23). This sort of adaptation may be what is happening in Romans 9–11, a text so tenaciously certain of Israel's future salvation

³³ Jer 1,1.5; Gal 1,15-16; see Jer 7,1-15 and the discussion in J.D. LEVENSON, *Sinai and Zion* (San Francisco, CA 1985) 165-169.

³⁴ Rom 15,30-32; Jer 38,1-28.

³⁵ SOMMER, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 36-40.

³⁶ SOMMER, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 41.

that it inverts the language of judgment in Jeremiah 1–20 to communicate the contours of this future redemption.

Of course, Romans 9–11 has other relationships with Jeremiah beside redemptive inversions. Romans 9,21 echoes the potter story of Jeremiah 18. Indeed, Paul's point in 9,21 that the potter is free to make different vessels from the same lump (φύραμα, the same word that is used to say how the first fruits sanctifies the whole lump in 11,16) is developed more in Jer 18,1–12 than it is in Isa 29,16, the text he ostensibly quotes. Isa 29,16a is linked in the targums by verbal parallels with Jer 18,6b, as Ross Wagner has shown, to suggest that Isaiah 29,16 was read alongside Jer 18,6³⁷. Why does Paul not quote from Jeremiah if Jeremiah is expressing his point about God's freedom to form Israel as God wishes? Perhaps it is because the potter paragraph in Jeremiah 18 includes the calamity oracle against Judah and Jerusalem in verse 11. Paul could not risk anyone reading a quotation from Jeremiah on the potter and associating it with the prediction of evil upon Judah and Jerusalem. Just as Paul does not quote from blocks of the book of Isaiah that contain judgment oracles against Jerusalem and the Jewish nation³⁸, so perhaps the potter analogy in Romans 9 avoids quoting Jeremiah, the prophet of judgment whose book is framed by the fall of Jerusalem, when he is writing a letter to show that he is not against the Torah or its people, shortly before traveling to Jerusalem³⁹.

The advance that I seek to make in our understanding of the use of the scriptures in Romans is therefore to prompt consideration that even in places where the letter to the Romans does not quote scripture, it is wrestling intensely with scripture. Koch missed this by explaining away places like 1 Cor 1,31; 2 Cor 3,6 and 10,17, and claiming that Paul nowhere clearly quotes from Jeremiah⁴⁰.

³⁷ WAGNER, *Heralds of the Good News*, 70–71 n. 88.

³⁸ WAGNER, *Heralds of the Good News*, 344 n. 5: "The only major blocks of material in Isaiah from which Paul does not draw quotations or allusions in Romans are the pronouncements against the nations in Isaiah 13–23, the various oracles in chapters 30–35, and the historical narrative in chapters 36–39". It should also be noted that the first two "blocks of material" listed include prophecies against Jerusalem (22,1–14) and against the Jewish nation (30,8–17). Paul may not explicitly quote from Jeremiah for the same reason that he does not quote from these sections of Isaiah that include warnings of judgment against God's people.

³⁹ Jer 1,3; 46,3; Rom 3,1–2.21.31; 4,1–25; 7,12.14; 9,1–5; 15,30–32.

⁴⁰ KOCH, *Die Schrift als Zeuge*, 45.

Koch's explanation for why Paul does not quote from Jeremiah arises from his sense of the very limited role that Jeremiah played in the Judaism contemporary to Paul, an explanation that is questionable in view of the paucity of evidence we have for pre-70 first-century Judaism and the ample citations of Jeremiah that Koch admits in the rest of the NT ⁴¹. The letters of Romans and 1 Corinthians wrestle with Jeremiah even without quoting him.

IV. The Lone Quote of Jeremiah in Romans 9–11

But there is one quotation from Jeremiah in Romans 9–11. At Romans 11,27 we see an example of what Fishbane and Sommer call “reprediction”, where a prophetic prediction is announced again. Here Paul quotes LXX Jer 38,33a (MT 31,33a) — αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη (“This is the covenant”). With ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν (“when I will forgive their sins”), Paul is clearly quoting Isa 27,9 (ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν), but it is worth noting that the forgiveness of sins is at the end of Jeremiah's list of promises following the phrase “This is the covenant” that Paul quotes (see LXX Jer 38,34d — καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι). While not all scholars of the Jewish scriptures are as ready to find “reprediction” as Fishbane and Sommer are, in light of the Hosea quotations in Rom 9,25–29 it appears that Paul can quote from the prophets in order to import a prediction into his own generation. Sommer notes how Deutero-Isaiah draws on chapters 30–33 of Jeremiah as the “richest mine” of Jeremiah's texts that he uses positively in reprediction ⁴². Sommer shows how texts like Isa 42,5–9 and Isa 54,10 recall the language of MT Jer 31,31–36. While Deutero-Isaiah minimizes or ignores some extreme aspects of Jeremiah's new covenant language, he still seeks to show that his prophecies fit the general program of this section of Jeremiah ⁴³. We have already observed that in Romans 9–11 there are

⁴¹ “Doch entspricht ihre Nichtbeachtung bei Paulus der offenbar recht geringen Rolle, die sie im zeitgenössischen Judentum gespielt haben” (KOCH, *Die Schrift als Zeuge*, 46; citations of Jeremiah in NT and early Christian literature, *ibid.* n. 11).

⁴² SOMMER, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 46.

⁴³ SOMMER, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 46–50.

some “reversals” or redemptive inversions from the first third of the book of Jeremiah that are similar to some “reversals” found in Deutero-Isaiah. Now in Romans 11,27 we see a reprediction of the new covenant in a way analogous to Deutero-Isaiah’s edited repredictions. The new covenant language of Jeremiah surfaces alongside a redeemer passage from Isaiah that is inverted to say that the redeemer comes out of Zion, a change that Sommer might call “historical recontextualization” and that Wagner calls “a fundamental interpretive shift” couching Isa 59,20 in a Diaspora perspective ⁴⁴. All this is simply to offer evidence for my point that the text of Romans 9–11 makes use of Jeremiah in ways very similar to how Deutero-Isaiah uses Jeremiah. Though there are no verbatim quotations of Jeremiah until Rom 11,27, these chapters in Romans reconfigure the largely negative portrait of Israel in Jeremiah 1–20. The allusive, redemptive inversions give way to a positive reprediction when Paul finally does quote from a more positive section of Jeremiah in Romans 11,27.

In light of the quotation from LXX Jer 38,33a (MT Jer 31,33a) in Romans 11,27a one might be able to claim that the inversions of material from Jeremiah 1–20 are simply following the inversions Jeremiah himself offers in his hopeful scroll, centered on MT chapters 30–33 (LXX chapters 37–40), but actually comprising MT chapters 26–36 (LXX chapters 33–43) ⁴⁵. This is a scroll of hopeful words that Jeremiah is told to write (MT Jer 30,1-3; LXX Jer 37,1-3). The reversal, the dissonance in intratextuality within Jeremiah, is due to God. Jeremiah is dismayed by the shift of YHWH’s will from definite judgment to a hopeful future (MT Jer 32,24-25; LXX Jer 39,24-25) ⁴⁶. In personal correspondence, Holladay comments on this shift: “It is fascinating that in all this there is no trace of Jeremiah’s saying ‘I *misunderstood* God in all those years in which I set forth his judgment,’ nor of accusing God of *deceiving* him with

⁴⁴ SOMMER, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 52-54; WAGNER, *Heralds of the Good News*, 284.

⁴⁵ This suggestion was made to me by T.D. Still on November 24, 2002. W.L. HOLLADAY guided me to follow this suggestion further in a letter of March 2, 2004.

⁴⁶ HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 2*, 22-23 (dates the hopeful scroll to 597 and suggests that Baruch wrote chapters 26 and 36 to bracket the scroll) 206-212, 220 (gives exegesis of sections of the hopeful scroll that contain the reversal that YHWH is showing towards the Judean people).

regard to judgment (indeed he accuses God of deceive [*sic*] the *optimists*, 4:10), nor of trying to persuade Baruch to suppress that earlier, judgmental scroll that became the core of chapters 1–20. It is all out there in this awesome divine shift”⁴⁷.

V. The Reconfiguration of Scripture in Romans 9–11

The exegesis of scripture in Romans 9–11 is not simply a recitation of proof texts to support Paul’s understanding of the mystery of Israel, as if all he needed to do were enter these proof texts into his computer as an elaborate password that will give him a complete purchase on God’s plan for Israel. Whether intentional or not in the letter’s composition, a reader’s recognition of the reversals of Jeremiah 1–20 provide increased understanding of these central chapters in Romans and the whole letter’s argument.

The significance of these chapters’ relationship to Jeremiah, encapsulated in the inversion of the olive tree whose branches are burned up into the cultivated olive tree with plenty of fatness, whose branches are cut off but can easily be re-grafted onto the tree, is that Paul’s positive approach to corporeal Israel is underscored. It becomes very difficult to view Israel here as simply a re-defined Israel, a cipher for the church. The chapters offer a reading of Jeremiah that bring one to the vision of God’s mercy even now (accepting with Barth the second $\nu\upsilon\nu$ in Rom 11,31) on Paul’s kinsfolk according to the flesh⁴⁸. Baxter and Ziesler’s exegetical in-

⁴⁷ HOLLADAY, letter of March 2, 2004, his emphases.

⁴⁸ The external evidence is fairly strong, with \aleph B D*, but I do admit that the significant witnesses *P*⁴⁶ and 1739 lack it. K. BARTH, *The Epistle to the Romans* (trans. E.C. Hoskyns; London 1933; reprint ed., 1980) 420, renders 11,31 as “even so have these also now been disobedient, that by the mercy shewn to you they also may now obtain mercy” and comments on the second “now”: “What can this mean, but that now — the eternal ‘Now’ which de-thrones ‘Here’ but exalts ‘There’, and displays both ‘Here’ and ‘There’ the freedom and the majesty of God — now the elect are sureties for the reprobate, that they, bearing the burden of the elect, may participate also in the mercy which belongs to the elect. And so the new invisible title of all humanity is made manifest in the ‘Now’ of revelation” (421). BRYAN follows BARTH here, quoting his *Church Dogmatics* 2.2.305 regarding the same verse: “What this striking second $\nu\upsilon\nu$ (*sic*) makes quite impossible for Christian anti-Semitism (he that has ears to hear, let him hear) is the relegation of the Jewish question into the realm of eschatology” (BRYAN, *A Preface to Romans* 183, see also 193).

instincts about the function of the olive tree in Romans 11 are confirmed by this broader study of the dissonant intertextuality between Romans 9–11 and Jeremiah. The olive tree example in Rom 11,17-24 has as its main point the “rejuvenation” of ethnic Israel, as do the redemptive inversions of the first scroll of Jeremiah ⁴⁹.

One wonders if the only verbatim quotation from Jeremiah in this section, LXX Jer 38,33a in Rom 11,27, is offered as a resolution to the tensions that the inversions have been arousing in the preceding paragraphs of Romans 9–11. Finally, the letter to the Romans openly joins the prophet it has been allusively inverting and with one voice they declare: “and this will be my covenant with them, when I forgive their sins” ⁵⁰.

Marian University
Indianapolis, IN
U.S.A.

Mark REASONER

SUMMARY

This article presents seven points of focused dissonance between Jeremiah and Romans, by identifying how Romans 9–11 inverts the judgment language of Jeremiah 1–20 against Judah. Without claiming that the inversions in Romans 9–11 are intentional, the article argues that the inversions of this section of Jeremiah are similar to the inversions that Deutero-Isaiah performs on this same section of Jeremiah, identified by B. Sommer. The inversions of Jeremiah that occur in Romans 9–11 highlight these chapters’ positive stance toward corporeal, ethnic Israel, and provide another argument against interpreting “all Israel” in Rom 11,26 as the church.

⁴⁹ A. G. BAXTER - J. A. ZIESLER, “Paul and Arboriculture: Romans 11.17-24”, *JSNT* 24 (1985) 25-32, especially 29.

⁵⁰ An earlier version of this paper was presented on November 24, 2002 in the Pauline Epistles section of the AAR-SBL meeting in Toronto. I am indebted to all those who offered comments there. J. Kaminsky and W. L. Holaday read the paper later and contributed very helpful comments. All the mistakes and weaknesses of this paper remain my own responsibility.

Das Einführen des Erstgeborenen in die οἰκουμένη (Hebr 1,6a)

Die Bedeutung des griechischen Textes in Hebr 1,6a (ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει) als Einleitung des darauffolgenden Zitates mit der Engelshuldigung gibt bis heute ein in der Hebräerforschung äusserst umstrittenes Rätsel auf: Was meint der *auctor ad Hebraeos* mit der εἰσαγωγή des πρωτότοκος in die οἰκουμένη?

I. Die umstrittene Bedeutung von Hebr 1,6a

Die vorgeschlagenen Deutungen reichen von der Präsentation des Sohnes nach der Schöpfung über die Inkarnation, die Taufe, die Erhöhung in den Himmel (bzw. die himmlische Inthronisation) bis zur Parusie. Diese werden im Folgenden in heilgeschichtlicher Reihenfolge besprochen und auf ihre Plausibilität untersucht.

1. Die Präsentation des Sohnes nach der Schöpfung

Diese Position wurde von Bleek in seinem Kommentar von 1836 vertreten. Das Einführen des Sohnes bezieht sich seiner Meinung nach “auf einen feierlichen Akt”, wo “Gott der Vater den Sohn schon vor der Fleischwerdung den durch ihn geschaffenen Wesen [= οἰκουμένη] als den Erstgeborenen, als ihren Schöpfer und Beherrscher, der alles tragen und leiten sollte, gleichsam vorgeführt und dargestellt [hat]”.¹ Angesichts der Tatsache, dass 1) im Hebräerbrief sowie in der gesamten biblischen und apokryphen Literatur jeglicher Hinweis auf ein solches Ereignis fehlt und 2) das Verb εἰσαγάγειν mit seinem Normalgebrauch “hineinführen” für einen tatsächlichen Ortswechsel und gegen ein blosses “Darstellen” spricht, ist diese

¹ Vgl. F. BLEEK, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Erläutert durch Einleitung, Uebersetzung und fortlaufenden Commentar (Berlin 1836) 134-135.

Deutung doch sehr unwahrscheinlich. Selbst Bleek hat später Abstand davon genommen ².

2. Die Inkarnation

Dass sich die εἰσαγωγή des Erstgeborenen in die οἰκουμένη auf die Fleischwerdung des Sohnes Gottes bezieht, ist seit Athanasius und Chrysostomos von vielen älteren Auslegern postuliert worden (so z. B. auch von Thomas Aquinas und Luther) ³. In der neueren Forschung vertreten diese Position unter anderen Vitti, Spicq, Montefiore, Attridge, Hughes und McKnight ⁴.

Grundlegend für diese Interpretation ist, dass man πάλιν nicht als ein temporales Adverb zu εἰσαγάγει, sondern — wie in V.5 — als Zitateinleitungsformel versteht und auf λέγει bezieht ⁵. Weiter machen die Vertreter der Inkarnationsthese geltend, dass die Konstruktion ὅταν mit Konjunktiv Aorist (εἰσαγάγει) nicht zwingend futurisch gedeutet werden müsse (mit Verweis auf 1 Kor 15,27) ⁶ oder dass, wenn die Konstruktion doch ein *futurum exactum* sein müsse, der zukünftige Zeitpunkt nicht von der Position des Hebräers her zu sehen sei, sondern von der des alttestamentlichen Autors, der zitiert wird ⁷.

Als ein zentrales Argument für die Inkarnationsthese (und gegen die vielvertretene Erhöhungsthese, siehe unten) führt Attridge an, dass sie den “normalen” (naheliegenderen) Sinn von οἰκουμένη als “inhabited human world” ernst nehme ⁸. Spicq weist weiter darauf

² In seinem späteren Kommentar vertritt er die Inkarnationsthese; vgl. F. BLEEK, *Der Hebräerbrieff* (Elberfeld 1868) 108.

³ Vgl. dazu H. BRAUN, *An die Hebräer* (HNT 14; Tübingen 1984) 36.

⁴ Vgl. A. M. VITTI, “Et cum iterum introducit Primogenitum in orbem terrarum”, *VD* 14 (1934) 306-312; C. SPICQ, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris 1952) II, 17; H. MONTEFIORE, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (BNTC 16; London 1964) 45-46; P.H.E. HUGHES, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI 1977) 60; H.W. ATTRIDGE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA 1989) 55-56; E. MCKNIGHT – Chr. CHURCH, *Hebrews-James* (SHBC; Macon, GA 2004) 48.

⁵ Vgl. z. B. SPICQ, *Hébreux*, 17.

⁶ Vgl. z. B. ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 55, Anm. 64.

⁷ Vgl. HUGHES, *Hebrews*, 58.

⁸ Vgl. ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 56.

hin, dass εἰσαγάγειν εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην dem alten hebräischen Ausdruck für die Geburt entspreche (מְבִיאִים לְהַבִּיאַת) ⁹. Montefiore fügt zudem an, dass es sich bei Hebr 1,6b wahrscheinlich um eine Anlehnung an “the heavenly host described in Luke ii. 13” handle, und möglicherweise habe πρωτότοκος (1,6a) die gleiche “literale” Bedeutung wie in Lk 2,7 gehabt ¹⁰.

Was sagen nun die Kritiker dieser Inkarnationsthese? M. E. mit Recht erwähnt Ellingworth eine grosse Schwäche dieser These: Der *auctor ad Hebraeos* sieht in der Inkarnation des Sohnes einen Akt der Erniedrigung (vgl. 2,8: τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν), die mit der Engelshuldigung in 1,6b nur sehr schwer vereinbar ist ¹¹. Grässer sieht die Deutung auf die Inkarnation hin auch deshalb ausgeschlossen, weil πάλιν klar nicht auf λέγει zu beziehen sei, sondern auf εἰσαγάγει ¹².

Wenn dem so ist, dann scheint die Inkarnationsthese tatsächlich ausgeschlossen, insofern der Sohn ja bei der Inkarnation zum ersten Mal in die Welt eingeführt worden ist; denn πάλιν hat in Hebr 1,6 unbestrittenerweise die Bedeutung von “wieder”. Darum soll die Frage nach dem Bezugswort von πάλιν im Folgenden genauer untersucht werden.

Das Adverb πάλιν kommt im Hebräerbrief 10-mal vor und dient in 1,5; 2,13 (2-mal); 4,5 und 10,5 als Einleitung eines zweiten Zitates (stets in Bezug auf eine dem ersten Zitat vorausgegangene Form des Verbes λέγειν). Interessant ist, dass dem πάλιν in diesen erwähnten Stellen, wo es als Einleitungsformel eines Zitats funktioniert, immer ein καί vorangestellt ist (so auch bei Paulus, vgl. Röm 15,11.12.13 und 1 Kor 3,20; siehe auch Joh 19,37) ¹³. Dass in Hebr 1,6a kein καί vorangestellt ist, spricht somit eher *gegen* die Funktion als Einleitungsformel. Grässer führt zudem mit Recht an, dass der Hebr πάλιν nur dann in diesem einleitenden Sinn gebraucht, wenn “eine Mehrzahl von Worten ein- und dieselbe Situation meint”, was

⁹ Vgl. SPICQ, *Hébreux*, 17.

¹⁰ Vgl. MONTEFIORE, *Hebrews*, 46.

¹¹ Vgl. P. ELLINGWORTH, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2000) 117. Zudem wird in Lk 2,13 ja auch nicht Jesus, sondern Gott gepriesen.

¹² Vgl. E. GRÄSSER, *An die Hebräer* (EKK XVII/1; Neukirchen 1990) *Hebräer*, 77.

¹³ In Hebr 4,5 ist noch ἐν τούτῳ (“an dieser [Stelle]”) dazwischen gestellt.

aber in Hebr 1,5-6 nicht zutrifft ¹⁴. Weiter ist m. E. sehr fraglich, dass der *auctor ad Hebraeos* das Stilmittel des Hyperbaton anwendet, wenn er dabei Gefahr läuft, missverstanden zu werden, insofern die Verbindung mit dem (positions-mässig) naheliegenderen Bezugswort εἰσαγάγη auch Sinn macht. Dazu kommt die Tatsache, dass der Autor in den restlichen Stellen, wo πάλιν vorkommt (Hebr 4,7; 5,12; 6,1.6), das Adverb *nie* durch einen anderen (Neben-) Satz vom Verb sperrt. Ellingworth sagt darum m. E. mit Recht, dass man ein einleitendes πάλιν direkt vor λέγει erwarten würde und nirgends sonst (vgl. Röm 15,10.12!) ¹⁵.

Es spricht also vieles dafür, dass πάλιν auf εἰσαγάγη zu beziehen ist und dass es dem Autor um das Wieder-Einführen des Sohnes geht und dass damit die Inkarnationsthese dem Text nicht gerecht werden kann.

3. Die Taufe

Eine einzigartige Interpretation der Einführung des Erstgeborenen vertritt Bateman. Weil er Hebr 1,6a durch die Erwähnung des πρωτότοκος in enger Verbindung mit Hebr 1,5 liest (υἱός μου εἶ σύ), sieht Bateman in der εἰσαγωγή “probably” die Taufe des Sohnes angesprochen: “God clearly introduces Jesus as His Son with Psalm 2,7, at Jesus’ baptism” (mit Verweis auf Mt 3,16-17 par.) ¹⁶. Auch wenn die Kreativität des Ansatzes nicht zu verachten ist, sprechen doch drei Gründe gegen diese Interpretation: 1) ist die Taufe als ein irdisches Ereignis, das (wie die Inkarnation) in die Zeit der Erniedrigung (vgl. Hebr 2,5-9) einzuordnen ist, nur schwer mit der Engelshuldigung in Hebr 1,6b vereinbar; 2) ist ein Wieder-Einführen im Zusammenhang mit der Taufe nicht verständlich; 3) wird die Reduktion der εἰσαγωγή des πρωτότοκου auf ein Vorstellen des Christus als “Erstgeborener” dem Text in Hebr 1,6a, wonach der Sohn in einem Akt der Bewegung εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην eingeführt wird, nicht gerecht.

¹⁴ Vgl. GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 77.

¹⁵ Vgl. ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 117; ein Nebeneinander von einem einleitenden und einem temporalen πάλιν war z. B. auch bei Philo und Plutarch nicht unüblich; siehe die Belegstellen bei BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 36.

¹⁶ Vgl. H. W. BATEMAN IV, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5-13. The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage* (AmUSt. TR 7/193, New York 1997) 222.

4. Die Erhöhung und Inthronisation

In der neueren Forschung ist die These, dass mit der Einführung des Sohnes in die οἰκουμένη durch Gott die Erhöhung und anschließende himmlische Inthronisation gemeint sei, die am meisten vertretene in den Kommentaren (vgl. z. B. Buchanan, Bruce, Grässer, Lane, Weiss, Pfitzner, Ellingworth, Koester, Thompson, Backhaus, D.L. Allen und Cockerill¹⁷) und Monographien bzw. Artikeln (vgl. z. B. Schierse, Johnston, Vanhoye, Andriessen, Eisele, Rascher, D.M. Allen, Caneday und Wipp¹⁸). Backhaus z. B. versteht das Wieder-Einführen des Erstgeborenen als die „Rückkehr des Sohnes [...] in die ursprüngliche, nur kurze Zeit verlassene (2,9) göttliche Machtstellung“; die Proskynese der Engel (Hebr 1,6b) sieht er dementsprechend als „liturgischen Akt beim himmlischen

¹⁷ Vgl. G.W. BUCHANAN, *To the Hebrews*. Translation, Comment and Conclusions (AB 36; Garden City, NY 1972) 17f; F.F. BRUCE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1990) 58; GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 78-79; W.L. LANE, *Hebrews 1-8* (WBC; Dallas, TX 1991) 27-28; H.-F. WEISS, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KEK XIII; Göttingen¹⁵ 1991) 162-164; V.C. PFITZNER, *Hebrews* (ANTC; Nashville, TN 1992) 54f; ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 117-118; C.R. KOESTER, *Hebrews*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 36; Garden City, NY 2001) 192-193; J.W. THOMPSON, *Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI 2008) 54; K. BACKHAUS, *Der Hebräerbrief* (RNT; Regensburg 2009) 96-97; D.L. ALLEN, *Hebrews* (NAC; Nashville, TN 2010) 174f; G.L. COCKERILL, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2011) 104.

¹⁸ Vgl. F.J. SCHIERSE, *Verheissung und Heilsvollendung*. Zur theologischen Grundfrage des Hebräerbriefes (MThS.H 9; München 1955) 95-96; G. JOHNSTON, „ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗ und ΚΟΣΜΟΣ in the New Testament“, *NTS* 10 (1964) 354; A. VANHOYE, „L'οἰκουμένη dans l'Épître aux Hebreux“, *Bib* 45 (1964) 248-253; P.C.B. ANDRIESSEN, „La Teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de HE I 6 et II 14B-III 2“, *NT* 18 (1976) 293-313; W. EISELE, *Ein unerschütterliches Reich*. Die mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief (BZNW 116; Berlin 2003) 49-65; A. RASCHER, *Schriftauslegung und Christologie im Hebräerbrief* (BZNW 153; Berlin 2007) 91; A.B. CANEDAY, „The Eschatological World Already Subjected to the Son. The Οἰκουμένη of Hebrews 1:6 and the Son's Enthronement“, *A Cloud of Witnesses*. The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts (eds. R. BAUCKHAM – D. DRIVER u. a.) (LNTS 387; New York – London 2008) 33; D.M. ALLEN, *Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews* (WUNT 238; Tübingen 2008) 55-58; J.W. WIPP, „The Son's Entrance into the Heavenly World. The Soteriological Necessity of the Scriptural Catena in Hebrews 1.5-14“, *NTS* 56 (2010) 562-563.

Herrschaftsantritt”¹⁹. Grässer seinerseits spricht von der “Erhöhung als [einer] Inthronisation, bei der die Engel Huldigung darbringen”²⁰. Grundlegend für die Erhöhungs- bzw. Inthronisationsthese ist die Deutung von οἰκουμένη als himmlische Welt²¹.

Ein wichtiges Argument, das immer wieder für diese These angebracht wird, ist der Kontext von Hebr 1,6a. Koester z. B. sagt, das Exordium sei so konstruiert, dass Hebr 1,5-14 das unterstütze, was in 1,1-4 gesagt worden sei; und wenn nun die Beschreibung des Sohnes mit der “exaltation as heir” (1,2b) begonnen habe und seine Erhabenheit über die Engel mit der Erhöhung verknüpft sei (1,4), dann sei es “[the] most natural to connect 1:6 with the exaltation”²². Für Wipp, der in der ganzen Zitatensreihe Hebr 1,5-14 den Bezug zum himmlischen Herrschaftsantritt Christi sieht (Hebr 1,13 = “the Son’s exaltation above all enemies”; 1,10-12 = “his eternal and virtuous rule”; 1,8-9 “his sharing of God’s eternal throne”; 1,4-5 = “his [heavenly] inheritance of the name ‘Son’”), ist es ebenso “logical”, dass, nachdem der Autor in Hebr 1,3c-5 die Erhöhung des Sohnes zur Rechten des Vaters beschrieben habe, in Hebr 1,6 das Thema fortsetze²³. Auch der unmittelbare Kontext von Hebr 1,6a, die Proskynese der Engel in 1,6b, ist für die Vertreter der Inthronisationsthese von entscheidender argumentativer Bedeutung, und zwar insofern, dass die Huldigung der Engel nicht zur Wiederkunft passen würde, wohl aber zur Erhöhung (mit Verweis auf Phil 2,11 und Offb 5,6-10)²⁴.

Ein weiteres oft angeführtes Argument für die Inthronisationsthese ist Hebr 2,5, wo von der οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν, die Rede ist. Nach Eisele kann mit der “kommenden Welt” nicht die diesseitige Welt gemeint sein (weil die ja schon da sei); und wenn der Autor mit dem Zusatz περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν auf Hebr 1,6 zurückweise, müsse folglich auch dort die künftige, jenseitige Welt gemeint sein²⁵.

¹⁹ Vgl. BACKHAUS, *Hebräer*, 97.

²⁰ Vgl. GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 78.

²¹ Vgl. z. B. KOESTER, *Hebrews*, 193.

²² Vgl. KOESTER, *Hebrews*, 193.

²³ Vgl. WIPP, “The Son’s Entrance”, 562-563.

²⁴ Vgl. z. B. ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 117-118; THOMPSON, *Hebrews*, 54.

²⁵ Vgl. EISELE, *Unerschütterliches Reich*, 64; so z. B. auch LANE, *Hebrews*, 27.

Koester fügt als Argument für die Interpretation von οἰκουμένη als "himmlische Welt" weiter an, dass der *auctor ad Hebraeos*, wenn er von der gegenwärtigen Welt spreche, immer das Wort κόσμος verwende (vgl. Hebr 4,3; 9,26; 10,5; 11,7.38) ²⁶. Grässer verweist besonders auf Hebr 10,5, wo vom Kommen Jesu in diese Welt und eben im Gegensatz zu Hebr 1,6 vom κόσμος die Rede sei, was gegen die Parusie- und für die Erhöhungsthese spreche ²⁷. Vanhoye ²⁸ zieht als Untermauerung des Verständnisses von οἰκουμένη als "himmlische Welt" Hebr 12,27 hinzu, wo von der "Verwandlung der Dinge" die Rede ist, die als geschaffene Dinge "erschüttert werden" (τῶν σαλευομένων), damit die "unerschütterlichen" (τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα) bleiben sollten, was die eschatologische, himmlische Welt meine. Er sieht darin nämlich eine Anlehnung an Ps^{LXX} 95,9-10, wo es (paradoxerweise) heisst, dass die ganze Erde vor Jahwe erzittern solle (σαλευθήτω πᾶσα ἡ γῆ), die Welt aber feststehen und nicht wanken werde (κατάρθωσεν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἥτις οὐ σαλευθήσεται). Mit anderen Worten: Wenn das "Unerschütterliche" in Hebr 12,27 die οἰκουμένη im Gegensatz zur erschütterlichen Erde (γῆ) meint, muss jene eine himmlische Welt bedeuten ("l'éon à venir, la réalité eschatologique"), was auch für οἰκουμένη in 1,6 zu gelten habe.

Auch das Verb εἰσαγάγειν spricht nach Koester für die Erhöhungsthese, weil das synonyme Verb εἰσέρχεσθαι immer im Zusammenhang mit dem Eingehen in die himmlische Ruhe (Hebr 3,11.18.19; 4,1.3.5.6.10.11) oder dem Eintreten in das himmlische Heiligtum (6,19-20; 9,12.24-25) verwendet werde ²⁹.

Ein weiteres wichtiges Argument, das von vielen Vertretern der Erhöhungsthese vorgebracht wird ³⁰, geht auf eine Untersuchung von Hebr 1,6 in Bezug auf seine jüdisch-alttestamentliche Verwurzelung durch Andriessen zurück. Andriessen ³¹ sieht in Hebr 1,6a eine bewusste Anlehnung an Stellen wie Dtn^{LXX} 6,10 und 11,29, wo es jeweils heisst: καὶ ἔσται ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰς τὴν γῆν. Nach Ex 3,8 und anderen Stellen sei dieses Land (γῆ), wo Israel hineingeführt werde, das verheissene Land ("la terre

²⁶ Vgl. KOESTER, *Hebrews*, 193; ähnlich BACKHAUS, *Hebräer*, 96.

²⁷ Vgl. GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 79.

²⁸ Zum Folgenden siehe VANHOYE, "L'οἰκουμένη", 250-251.

²⁹ Vgl. KOESTER, *Hebrews*, 192.

³⁰ Vgl. z. B. WEISS, *Hebräer*, 163 und ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 118.

³¹ Zum Folgenden siehe ANDRIESSEN, "La Teneur", 295-299.

promise“). In Hebr 1,6a sei nun das *σε* durch *πρωτότοκον* ersetzt worden, wobei aber weiterhin der Gedanke der Einführung der Israeliten in das verheissene Land im Hintergrund stehe; denn Israel sei ja der alttestamentliche Erstgeborene von Jahwe (vgl. Ex 4,22). Mit dem Gebrauch von *οἰκουμένη* anstatt *γῆ* betone der Hebr, dass das verheissene Land eine “terre habitée et cultivée” im Gegensatz zur Wüste sei (vgl. Ex 16,35). Das ergänzte *πάλιν* seinerseits lege die Betonung auf eine zweite Einführung des Erstgeborenen, insofern die “*préfiguration*” (= die Einführung des Volkes Israel ins Land Kanaan) “*son accomplissement par l’exaltation du Christ*” erhalte. Zusammenfassend sagt Andriessen, dass der Autor “*le vocabulaire classique*” benutze, “*pour l’appliquer à ce qui en est la réalité définitive: l’introduction du Premier-né de Dieu au ciel, la terre que Dieu nous a finalement promise et qui est notre *oikoumenè* pour toujours*”³².

Zuletzt sei noch die Bedeutung von *πρωτότοκος* als Argument für die Interpretation von Hebr 1,6a im Zusammenhang mit der Erhöhung bzw. Inthronisation erwähnt. Für Grässer ist *πρωτότοκος* kein “sachgemässer Titel für den am Ende der Tage wiederkommenden Menschensohn-Weltenrichter und -Retter”, wohl aber für den erhöhten Christus im Blick auf seine “Allerbschaft” (Hebr 1,2) und sein Sein als “Vorläufer” (6,20) seiner Brüder (2,11), “denen er durch seine Erhöhung den Weg aus der Knechtschaft bahnt” (mit Verweis auf 2,15; 4,14; 5,9 und 6,20)³³.

Die Argumente für die Erhöhungsthese sind gewichtig und bedürfen einer ausführlichen Untersuchung, die allerdings erst nach der Besprechung der Parusithese vorgenommen wird.

5. Die Parusie

Die Interpretation des Einführens des Erstgeborenen als die Wiederkunft/Parusie Christi vertreten in der alten Kirche u. a. Gregor von Nyssa und Hieronymus³⁴, im 19. Jh. unter vielen anderen z. B. DeWette und Delitzsch³⁵ und in der neueren Forschung u. a.

³² Vgl. ANDRIESSEN, “La Teneur”, 299.

³³ Vgl. GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 78.

³⁴ Vgl. HUGHES, *Hebrews*, 58.

³⁵ Vgl. W.M.L. DEWETTE, *Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an Titus, Timotheus und die Hebräer* (Leipzig 21847) 181; F. DELITZSCH, *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer* (Leipzig 1857) 24-25.

Riggenbach, Käsemann, Michel, Schröger, Loader, Braun, Rissi, März, Strobel und Balz ³⁶. So heisst es z. B. bei Strobel: "Unser Text hat das Erscheinen des Sohnes bei seiner nahen Wiederkunft im Auge, die nach allgemeiner urchristlicher Überzeugung in der Herrlichkeit der himmlischen Heere erfolgt" (mit Verweis auf Mk 13,26 u. a.) ³⁷. Zu den Vertretern der Parusie these gehört auch Hegermann, der allerdings im Bezug auf Hebr 1,6a von einem "himmlischen Auftakt" der Wiederkunft Christi ausgeht ³⁸.

Wie lauten nun die angebrachten Argumente für die Parusieinterpretation? Für Loader ist das ausschlaggebende Argument (für die Parusie und gegen die Erhöhung), dass οἰκουμένη "normalerweise 'die bewohnte Welt'" bedeute und es darum nicht wahrscheinlich sei, dass der Verfasser eine himmlische Welt meine, "ohne es für nötig zu halten, dies ausdrücklich durch einen Zusatz [wie in Hebr 2,5] zu bestimmen" ³⁹. Nach Braun ist auch die Parallele von Hebr 1,6a zu 9,28 und 10,5 wichtig, insofern πάλιν parallel zu ἐκ δευτέρου (9,28) zu lesen sei und es sich mit dem Ausdruck εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην auf das erste εἰσέρχεσθαι in die Welt (10,5) beziehe ⁴⁰. Loader führt weiter als Argument an, dass die in Hebr 1,6 geschilderte "Präsentation" des Sohnes in seiner Macht nach Hebr 2,8 und 1,13 erst bei der Parusie stattfinde ⁴¹. Rissi argumentiert ähnlich: "Erst die Wiedereinführung in die Welt wird die unvergleichliche Höhe der Stellung

³⁶ Vgl. E. RIGGENBACH, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KNT 14; Leipzig 1913) 18f; E. KÄSEMAN, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk. Eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief* (FRLANT 55; Göttingen ⁴1961) 60, 68-69; O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KEK XIII, Göttingen ¹²1966) 113, 115; F. SCHRÖGER, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefs als Schriftausleger* (BU 4; Regensburg 1968) 51-53; W. LOADER, *Sohn und Hoherpriester. Eine traditions geschichtliche Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes* (WMANT 53; Neukirchen-Vluy 1981) 24; BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 36; M. RISSI, *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs. Ihre Verankerung in der Situation des Verfassers und seiner Leser* (WUNT 41; Tübingen 1987) 53; C.-P. MÄRZ, *Hebräerbrief* (NEB.NT 16; Würzburg 1989) 25; A. STROBEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (NTD 9/2; Göttingen ¹³1991) 23; H. BALZ, "οἰκουμένη", *EWNT I* (³2011) 1232.

³⁷ Vgl. STROBEL, *Hebräer*, 23.

³⁸ Vgl. H. HEGERMANN, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (ThHK XVI; Berlin 1988) 52.

³⁹ Vgl. LOADER, *Sohn*, 24: er formuliert es als rhetorische Frage.

⁴⁰ Vgl. BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 36.

⁴¹ Vgl. LOADER, *Sohn*, 24: Die Herrschaft Jesu fange zwar nicht erst mit der Parusie an, sie werde aber erst dann sichtbar (ibid.).

des Sohnes enthüllen”⁴². Riggenbach sieht in der Konstruktion ὅταν mit Konjunktiv Aorist (εἰσαγάγη), die “nur” die Bedeutung eines *futurum exactum* haben könne, ein weiteres gewichtiges Argument für die in der Zukunft liegende Parusie⁴³.

Auch die Argumente für die Parusie als Zeitpunkt der Einführung Jesu in die οἰκουμένη bedürfen einer genaueren Analyse, die im Folgenden unternommen wird.

II. Die Auswertung

1. Die Frage nach dem *futurum exactum*

In der Auswertung der Argumente für bzw. gegen die Erhöhungs- bzw. die Parusiehypothese soll mit dem zuletzt genannten Argument von Riggenbach begonnen und gefragt werden: Ist ὅταν mit εἰσαγάγη grammatikalisch zwingend futurisch zu verstehen, und wenn ja, was beweist das? Nach Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf steht ὅταν mit Konjunktiv, “wenn eine Handlung in der Zukunft liegt (Eventualis), oder wenn eine Handlung häufig wiederkehrt (Iterativus)”⁴⁴. Gegen eine iterative Sinnrichtung in Hebr 1,6 spricht erstens, dass ὅταν mit Konjunktiv Aorist “meist” ein Eventualis ist⁴⁵. Nach meinen Untersuchungen ist die Konstruktion ὅταν mit Konjunktiv Aorist in 22 Fällen (von Apg bis Offb⁴⁶) 19-mal eindeutig futurisch zu verstehen⁴⁷; dazu kommt, dass die drei Ausnahmen (1 Kor 15,27; Tim 5,11; Offb 5,9) gemäss dem Kontext immer im Sinne einer all-

⁴² Vgl. RISSI, *Theologie*, 53.

⁴³ Vgl. RIGGENBACH, *Hebräer*, 18-19.

⁴⁴ Vgl. F. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER – F. REHKOPF, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen¹⁵1979) §382,3.

⁴⁵ Vgl. E. HOFFMANN – H. v. SIEBENTHAL, *Griechische Grammatik zum Neuen Testament* (Basel²1990) §276a.

⁴⁶ In den Evangelien hat die Konstruktion ὅταν mit Konjunktiv Aorist auch meistens einen klar futurischen Sinn (vgl. z. B. Mt 5,11; Mk 2,20; Lk 9,26; Joh 4,25); hie und da, vor allem in den Gleichnissen Jesu, ist sie zumindest nach unserem Sprachgefühl nicht eindeutig futurisch (vgl. z. B. Mt 13,32; Mk 4,29; Lk 8,13).

⁴⁷ Vgl. Apg 23,35; Röm 11,27; 1 Kor 16,2.3.5.12; 15,24.28.54; 13,10; 2 Kor 10,6; Kol 3,4; 4,16; Tit 3,12; Offb 11,4; 12,4; 17,10; 18,9; 20,7. In 1 Tim 5,11 kann die Konstruktion sowohl futurisch als auch iterativisch verstanden werden, in Offb 9,5 eher nicht und in 1 Kor 15,27 klar nicht futurisch.

gemeingültigen Aussage verstanden werden können ⁴⁸, was in Hebr 1,6 kaum möglich ist. Zweitens spricht gegen eine iterative Sinnrichtung auch die Tatsache, dass es “schwer fällt, ein stets sich wiederholendes Einführen des Erstgeborenen im Heilsgeschehen dingfest zu machen” ⁴⁹.

So müssen neben Eisele auch Grässer und Rascher, die ja alle Hebr 1,6 im Bezug auf die Erhöhung (also einem Ereignis der Vergangenheit) hin interpretieren, konstatieren, dass ὅταν mit εἰσαγάγῃ unbestreitbar futurisch gedeutet werden müsse ⁵⁰. Nun ist aber die Frage, was das beweist. Ellingworth sagt, dass dies gewiss nicht für die Parusie sprechen müsse, weil es Zukunft für den “speaker in the OT text” sein könne, “but past for the author of Hebrews” ⁵¹. Eisele seinerseits führt an, dass die Handlung aus der Warte dessen als zukünftig qualifiziert werde, “der aus Anlass der Wiedereinführung spricht (λέγει), das heisst aus der Perspektive Gottes” ⁵². Darauf kann man Folgendes erwidern: Die Person, die in Hebr 1,6a spricht, ist unbestritten der *auctor ad Hebraeos* und nicht der Psalmist und auch nicht Gott. Somit ist es grundsätzlich naheliegender, dass die Zukunft sich auch auf die Perspektive des Redenden bezieht. Zudem ist nur schwer erklärbar, warum der *auctor ad Hebraeos*, für den die zitierten alttestamentlichen Worte in Hebr 1,5-13 immer direkte Worte Gottes sind, plötzlich die Perspektive des Psalmisten wiedergeben sollte (gegen Ellingworth) bzw. warum der “zeitlose” ⁵³ Gott, der als ewiger Gott über der Zeit steht ⁵⁴, plötzlich doch als

⁴⁸ Vgl. 1 Tim 5,11: “Immer wenn sie Christus zuwider üppig geworden sind, wollen sie heiraten”; Offb 9,5: “Und ihre Qual war die Qual eines Skorpions, [die aufkommt,] wann immer er einen Menschen sticht”; auch 1 Kor 15,27 kann man ähnlich verstehen: “Wenn es aber [allgemeingültig] heisst ...”.

⁴⁹ Vgl. EISELE, *Unerschütterliches Reich*, 52. Nur Karrer vertritt eine iterativische Interpretation von Hebr 1,6a; nach seiner Meinung dürfen “Momente des Geschehenen” (Fleischwerdung und evtl. Erhöhung) “und des Kommenen [...] bis hin zur Parusie” “Raum behalten” (vgl. M. KARRER, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Kapitel 1,1–5,20 [ÖTK 20/1; Gütersloh 2002] 141).

⁵⁰ Vgl. EISELE, *Unerschütterliches Reich*, 52f; GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 77; RASCHER, *Schriftauslegung*, 90.

⁵¹ Vgl. ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 117.

⁵² Vgl. EISELE, *Unerschütterliches Reich*, 53.

⁵³ So EISELE selber (ibid.).

⁵⁴ Was in Hebr 13,8 über den Sohn gesagt ist, gilt insbesondere auch für den Vater, insofern der Sohn χαρακτηρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ ist (1,3).

ein in der Vergangenheit Verhafteter dargestellt werden sollte ⁵⁵ (gegen Eisele). Für einen zukünftigen Zeitpunkt aus Sicht des *auctor ad Hebraeos* spricht m. E. auch, dass bei Zusagen Gottes an den Sohn in Hebr 1,5-13, die auf ein heilsgeschichtliches Ereignis in der Vergangenheit zielen, das alttestamentliche Zitat jeweils mit dem Reden Gottes in einer Vergangenheitsform eingeführt wird (vgl. V.5 ⁵⁶ und V.13 ⁵⁷), bei die Gegenwart und/oder die Zukunft betreffenden Zusagen aber — wie in Hebr 1,6! — die Gegenwartsform steht (vgl. VV.8-9.10-12 ⁵⁸).

Kurz zusammengefasst, spricht das (aus der Sicht des *auctor ad Hebraeos*) zukünftige Einführen des Erstgeborenen in die οἰκουμένη mehr für die Parusie als für die Erhöhung ⁵⁹. Die Frage ist nun, ob diese Tendenz nach einer Auswertung der anderen Argumente bestehen bleibt.

2. Der Kontext

Wie gesehen, ist das grundlegendste Argument, das für die Erhöhungsthese angebracht wird, der Kontext, der in Hebr 1,2-13 durchwegs von der Inthronisation spreche. Dass in diesen Versen tatsächlich die Erhöhung Christi zur Rechten des Vaters immer wieder ein Thema ist (explizit in Hebr 1,2b.3c.4a.13; implizit vielleicht in 1,5a), ist unbestritten. Die Wahl der Zitate in Hebr 1,8-9 und 1,10-12 kann jedoch auch mit dem Ziel der Gegenüberstellung der Unveränderlichkeit des Sohnes und der Veränderlichkeit der Engel

⁵⁵ Insofern Gott in der Vergangenheit *gegenwärtig* (λέγει) auf die Zukunft hin reden würde.

⁵⁶ “[Z]u welchem der Engel hat er jemals gesagt (εἶπεν)”; das nachfolgende Zitat aus Ps 2,7 bezieht sich wahrscheinlich auf die Erhöhung des Sohnes; aber auch andere Ereignisse der Vergangenheit sind nicht gänzlich ausgeschlossen (zu einer Übersicht vgl. ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 113-114).

⁵⁷ “[Z]u welchem der Engel hat er jemals gesagt (εἶρηκεν)”; das anschließende Zitat aus Ps 110,1 steht offensichtlich im Zusammenhang mit der Erhöhung bzw. Inthronisation des Sohnes (vgl. Hebr 1,3d).

⁵⁸ Beide Zitate knüpfen an das λέγει in V.7 an; sie beziehen sich beide auf die gegenwärtige und/oder zukünftige Herrschaft Christi.

⁵⁹ λέγει würde dann für das *gegenwärtige* Reden Gottes in der Zukunft stehen: “(Zu dem Zeitpunkt,) wenn er aber den Erstgeborenen einführen wird in die Welt, *sagt* er ...”.

(1,7) ⁶⁰, der Darlegung seines erhabeneren Wesens (1,4a) ⁶¹ und der Erwähnung seines vorzüglicheren Namens (1,4b) ⁶² erklärt werden. Somit würde eine Deutung von Hebr 1,6 auf die Parusie hin keinen unpassenden Unterbruch in Kauf nehmen müssen, insbesondere auch darum nicht, weil man in der Einführung des Erstgeborenen in die Welt im Sinne der Parusie einen heilsgeschichtlichen Fortgang von der in Hebr 1,3d-5 beschriebenen Erhöhung sehen kann ⁶³.

Weiter wird von den Vertretern der Erhöhungsthese — wie gesehen — angeführt, dass die Engelshuldigung in 1,6b als unmittelbarer Kontext von 1,6a (mit Verweis auf Phil 2,11, Offb 5,6-10) besser zur Erhöhung als zur Parusie passen würde. Offb 5,6ff als Verweisstelle ist jedoch in keiner Weise stichhaltig, insofern dort nicht die Engel im allgemeinen Sinn, sondern lediglich die vier lebendigen (Himmels-) Wesen und vierundzwanzig Ältesten anbetend vor dem Sohn niederfallen; zudem findet diese Proskynese nicht anlässlich der Erhöhung des Sohnes statt, sondern im Zusammenhang mit dem (eschatologischen) Initialisieren des Endzeitgeschehens (vgl. 5,8 mit 6,1). Zu Phil 2,10-11, wonach sich neben allen anderen Geschöpfen auch alle himmlischen Wesen vor Jesus anbetend beugen, ist sogar zu sagen, dass die Stelle vielmehr als eine Verweisstelle für die Interpretation von Hebr 1,6b als Proskynese der Engel bei der Parusie gelten könnte. Hofius hat nämlich mit seiner ausführlichen Untersuchung des Christushymnus in Phil 2,6-11 m. E. überzeugend aufgezeigt, dass Phil 2,9-11 als Hintergrund die universale eschatologische Huldigung vor Jahwe hat (mit Jes 45,23 als Prätext) und die Verse somit “ein noch ausstehendes Geschehen vor Augen [haben]:

⁶⁰ Die Beschreibung der Engel in 1,7 als veränderliche “Winde” (πνεύματα) und “Feuerflammen” (πυρὸς φλόγα) steht der Charakterisierung des Sohnes als ewiger Herrscher (1,8: ὁ θρόνος σου [...] εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος) und unveränderlicher und unvergänglicher Gott (1,12) gegenüber (so z. B. auch THOMPSON, *Hebrews*, 54-55); und als gemachte Geschöpfe mit einem Anfang (ὁ ποιῶν) kontrastieren die Engel ihren ewig existierenden Schöpfer (1,10: κατ’ ἀρχάς [...] τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας).

⁶¹ Die Engel als “Diener” (λειτουργούς; 1,7) im Sinne von Befehle empfangenden Wesen stehen unter dem Sohn als Befehle gebendem König und Gott (1,8-9) und Schöpfer (1,10-12).

⁶² In 1,8-9 ist es die doppelte Anrede als ὁ θεός und in 1,10 diejenige als κύριε.

⁶³ Vgl. auch die mögliche Entsprechung von der Erhöhung von der Erde weg hin zur “Höhe” (ἐν ὑψηλοῖς) in 1,3d zu dem “Wieder-Einführen” in die (irdische) Welt (εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην) in 1,6a.

die Endverherrlichung Jesu" durch alle Geschöpfe, die zugleich auch die (alttestamentlich verheissene) Endverherrlichung Gottes, des Vaters, sein werde (vgl. V.11b) ⁶⁴. In diesem Zusammenhang ist zu sagen: Wenn in Hebr 1,13 und 2,8 die Rede davon ist, dass dem Sohn noch nicht alle Feinde zu Füßen liegen bzw. noch nicht alles unterworfen ist (vgl. auch 10,13), dann ist die Vorstellung, dass sich bei seiner Parusie (vgl. 9,28; 10,37) nicht nur die Feinde beugen werden, sondern jedes Geschöpf im ganzen Kosmos, und zwar zusammen mit den Engeln, zumindest nicht abwegig; die Engel sind in jedem Fall nach urchristlicher Meinung beim Geschehen mit dabei (vgl. z. B. Mt 16,27; 24,31; 25,31; Mk 13,27; 2 Thess 1,7; Offb 19,14-16).

3. Die Bedeutung der οἰκουμένη

Nun weiter zur wichtigen Frage, was der Gebrauch des Begriffs οἰκουμένη in Hebr 1,6a für Schlussfolgerungen zulässt. Das Wort kommt im Neuen Testament 15-mal vor, und zwar immer (von Hebr 1,6 und 2,5 einmal abgesehen) in der Bedeutung "bewohnte Erde", "Erdkreis" (vgl. z. B. Mt 24,14 und Apg 17,31) oder als Bezeichnung des Römischen Reiches bzw. seiner Bewohner (vgl. Lk 2,1; Apg 24,5 und 17,6), was auch dem Gebrauch in der Umwelt entspricht ⁶⁵. In der LXX kommt der Begriff 46-mal vor und zwar durchwegs in der Bedeutung "bewohnte Welt/Erde" (vgl. z. B. Ps 9,9; Spr 8,31; Jes 14,26; Klgl 4,12). Aufgrund der Tatsache, dass im Neuen Testament, in der Umwelt sowie in der LXX mit οἰκουμένη stets die diesseitige bewohnte Welt gemeint ist, scheint es mir sehr naheliegend zu sein, dass der auctor ad Hebraeos das Wort in 1,6 auch in dieser Bedeutung versteht und gebraucht, zumal er das Wort ohne Zusatz verwendet und dabei in Kauf nehmen muss, dass seine Leser es vom Normalgebrauch her verstehen.

Nun stellt sich aber sogleich die Frage nach Hebr 2,5 und der οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα. Was ist damit gemeint und worauf bezieht sich περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν? Selbst wenn sich der auctor ad Hebraeos mit der οἰκουμένη, "von der wir reden", auf Hebr 1,6 beziehen

⁶⁴ Vgl. O. HOFIUS, *Der Christushymnus. Philipper 2,6-11* (WUNT 17; Tübingen ²1991) 54.

⁶⁵ Vgl. BALZ, "οἰκουμένη", *EWNT* I, 1229-1233.

sollte (es gibt auch andere Erklärungen ⁶⁶), halte ich folgenden Schluss von Eisele für sehr fraglich: In Hebr 2,5 ist eine "jenseitige Welt des Himmels" gemeint, also muss dies auch für 1,6 gelten ⁶⁷. Denn Portalatin hat in seiner Dissertation m. E. überzeugend dargelegt, dass das Verb μέλλω sowohl in Hebr 2,5 (οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα) als auch 13,14 (πόλις ἡ μέλλουσα) eine zeitliche Bedeutung haben muss ⁶⁸. Die Näherbestimmung ἡ μέλλουσα qualifiziert die οἰκουμένη somit als eine "kommende" bzw. "zukünftige" Welt, die erst am Ende der Zeit durch die Erschütterung der alten Welt (vgl. 12,26-28) offenbart werden wird ⁶⁹ und nicht mit dem Himmel als Heiligtum (vgl. z. B. 9,24) — in den der Sohn bei der Erhöhung eingetreten ist — zu verwechseln ist, insofern der ja schon gegenwärtig da ist ⁷⁰. Diese Deutung wird dadurch unterstrichen, dass der *auctor ad Hebraeos* mit μελλῶν αἰῶν (Hebr 6,5) als einem Synonym für οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα einen *locus classicus* der Apokalyptik aufgreift (vgl. z. B. 4 Esr 7,50.111f; syrBar 83,8; siehe auch Mt 12,32 [ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι]; Mk 10,30 par [ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ]; Eph 1,21 [ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι]), der einen "zukünftigen Äon" meint, welcher sich erst am Ende der alten Zeit offenbaren wird (vgl. z. B. 4 Esr 7,26; syrBar 4,3). Dafür, dass die οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα in Hebr 2,5 eine eschatologische *Welt* meint, die erst mit der *Parusie* des Sohnes auf der Erde und seiner vollendeten Königsherrschaft im Sinne der verheissenen Weltherrschaft (vgl. z. B. Hebr 1,2; 10,13) hervortritt, spricht weiter die Tatsache, dass, obwohl Gott die οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα nach Hebr 2,5 dem Sohn bereits "unterworfen hat" (ὑπέταξεν), diese Unterwerfung nach Hebr 2,8c noch sichtbar werden muss (Νῦν δὲ οὐπω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποταγμένα). Nach Mackie geht es hier um den sichtbar-irdischen Raum, wenn er im Bezug auf Hebr 2,8 sagt: "An-

⁶⁶ Man könnte die Wendung auch als einen Rückgriff auf das Zitat in Hebr 1,13 sehen (vgl. z. B. RISSI, *Theologie*, 50) oder auf das Zitat in Hebr 1,12, wo von einer zukünftigen Verwandlung der Welt die Rede ist (vgl. 12,27!); Braun bezieht sie auf die in 2,3 beschriebene σωτηρία (*Hebräer*, 52).

⁶⁷ Vgl. EISELE, *Unerschütterliches Reich*, 64, 58.

⁶⁸ Vgl. A. PORTALATIN, *Temporal Oppositions as Hermeneutical Categories in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (EHS 23/833; Frankfurt 2006) 193-199.

⁶⁹ Siehe dazu auch RISSI, *Theologie*, 129 und E. ADAMS, "The Cosmology of Hebrews", *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology* (eds. R. BAUCKHAM – D. DRIVER u. a.) (Grand Rapids, MI 2009) 137-138.

⁷⁰ So auch RISSI (*Theologie*, 18, 44).

other indication of a preponderant temporal orientation is found in the fact that the Son's rule, while manifest in the coming world, has not yet extended to the visible realm"⁷¹. Ähnlich sieht es Brawley: "What is not seen is not merely the transcendent vertical reality: it is the horizontal future reality of the ultimate subjection of all things to Jesus"⁷². Dass es in Hebr 2,5 nicht um die gegenwärtige Himmelswelt, sondern um eine "irdisch"-zukünftige Welt geht, verdeutlicht zudem die Tatsache, dass im Himmel als dem Herrschafts- und Wohnort Gottes kaum zu unterwerfende Feinde vorhanden sind, wohl aber auf der Erde (vgl. z. B. Hebr 10,27; 12,3)⁷³. In 1 Kor 15,23-27, einer wichtigen urchristlichen Parallelstelle zu Hebr 2,5-8 als einer christologischen Auslegung von Ps 8,7, wird desweiteren das Unterwerfen von Allem explizit mit der *παρουσία* Christi verbunden. Mit Recht betont Backhaus in seiner Habilitationsschrift die Bedeutung der futurischen Eschatologie im Hebr, insofern das "in der himmlischen Wirklichkeit ewig vollzogene Heil 'am Ende' irdisch erfahrbar, universal durchgesetzt und damit vollendet wird (vgl. 1,6.13; 2,8; 9,28; 10,13)"; im "letzten Akt des Christus-Drama" werde "der Sohn bei seiner Wiederkunft der ganzen οἰκουμένη als Herrscher präsentiert (vgl. 1,6)"⁷⁴. Folglich ist auch der Schlussfolgerung von Balz beizupflichten, wenn er die οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα in Hebr 2,5 als "Christusherrschaft unter der Besiegung aller Feinde Gottes" versteht und daraus schliesst, dass auch das Einführen in die οἰκουμένη in Hebr 1,6 die Parusie im Blick haben müsse⁷⁵. Hebr 12,27 spricht nicht gegen diese Auslegung, insofern die Wendung "unerschütterliche Dinge" (τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα) zwar indirekt — wie von Vanhoye vorgeschlagen — die οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα meinen könnte, aber damit in keiner Weise die mögliche Deutung einer erneuerten Welt, die bei/nach der eschatologischen Erschütterung hervortritt, ausschliessen würde⁷⁶.

⁷¹ Vgl. S.D. MACKIE, *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (WUNT 223; Tübingen 2007) 7; die Hervorhebung ist von mir.

⁷² Vgl. R. L. BRAWLEY, "Discursive Structure and the Unseen in Hebrews 2:8 and 11:1. A Neglected Aspect of the Context", *CBQ* 55 (1993) 97.

⁷³ So auch RISSI, *Theologie*, 54 und GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 93-94.

⁷⁴ Vgl. K. BACKHAUS, *Der neue Bund und das Werden der Kirche. Die Diatheke-Deutung des Hebräerbriefs im Rahmen der frühchristlichen Theologiegeschichte* (NTA 29; Münster 1996) 240.

⁷⁵ Vgl. BALZ, "οἰκουμένη", *EWNT* I, 1232f-1233.

⁷⁶ Vgl. ADAMS, "The Cosmology", 136-138; J. LAANSMA, "Hidden stories in Hebrews. Cosmology and Theology", *A Cloud of Witnesses. The Theology*

4. Der Titel πρωτότοκος

Zuletzt soll nun auch noch auf die Frage eingegangen werden, was man aus dem Gebrauch von ὁ πρωτότοκος in der Bedeutung von “Erstgeborener” ⁷⁷ für Argumente ableiten darf. Wie gesehen ist für Grässer πρωτότοκος in Hebr 1,6 kein “sachgemässer” Titel für den wiederkommenden Christus, wohl aber für den Erhöhten als Allerbe (1,2) und Vorläufer (6,20) bzw. Erlöser (durch die Erhöhung, vgl. z. B. 4,14) seiner Brüder ⁷⁸. Mit Recht stellt Grässer sogleich den Bezug zu Hebr 1,2 her. Es ist m. E. nämlich sehr naheliegend, dass der *auctor ad Hebraeos* mit πρωτότοκος in Hebr 1,6 auf den nur vier Verse vorher erwähnten Allerben (1,2: κληρονόμος πάντων) rekurriert, zumal er den Begriff ohne Zusatz verwendet (anders z. B. in Kol 1,15.18: πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως bzw. ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν). Hebr 12,16 mit der Erwähnung des Erstgeburtsrechts (πρωτοτόκια) von Esau als dem Erstgeborenen zeigt auf jeden Fall, dass er den Zusammenhang von Erstgeburt und Erbschaft vor Augen hatte.

Dass in Hebr 1,2 die Allerbschaft im Zusammenhang mit der Erhöhung erwähnt wird (vgl. die Parallelität von ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον und ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ in 1,3), heisst nun aber nicht sogleich, dass πρωτότοκος im Sinne des Erben nicht zur Parusie Christi passen würde. Im Gegenteil: Hebr 1,13 und 2,5-8 zeigen, dass die Vollendung bzw. Realisierung der Allerbschaft (und der damit zusammenhängenden Allherrschaft) des Sohnes noch aussteht und erst mit der Parusie kommt, wenn der Erhöhte “sein Erbe in Besitz nimmt” ⁷⁹. Ähnlich sieht es z. B. auch Käsemann, wenn er zu Hebr 1,6 schreibt: “Jedenfalls bedeutet diese Endproskynese sachlich die öffentliche Besitzergreifung der Weltherrschaft, die Christus bei seiner [...] Erhöhung [...] bereits zugesprochen war” ⁸⁰.

Für eine solche Deutung von πρωτότοκος als dem kommenden Erben der Weltherrschaft spricht auch der sehr wahrscheinliche Bezug von Hebr 1,6a zu Ps^{LXX} 88,28, wo Jahwe verheisst, dass er

of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts (eds. R. BAUCKHAM – D. DRIVER u. a.) (LNTS 387; New York – London 2008) 9-18.

⁷⁷ Vgl. W. MICHAELIS, “πρωτότοκος”, *TWNT* VI (1959) 872-882.

⁷⁸ Vgl. GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 78.

⁷⁹ Vgl. STROBEL, *Hebräer*, 23.

⁸⁰ Vgl. KÄSEMANN, *Gottesvolk*, 69.

David (vgl. V.21) “zum Erstgeborenen” machen wird (πρωτότοκον θήσομαι), “zum Höchsten unter den Königen der Erde” (ὕψηλόν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τῆς γῆς). Ein wichtiges Argument für eine christologische Interpretation jenes Psalmverses durch den *auctor ad Hebraeos* ist die Tatsache, dass er unmittelbar vor Hebr 1,6 aus 1 Chr 17,13 (bzw. 2 Sam 7,14) folgenden Satz zitiert (Hebr 1,5b): “Ich werde ihm Vater und er wird mir Sohn sein”, und dass auf der anderen Seite in Ps^{LXX} 88,27 Jahwe sagt: “Er [David] wird mich anrufen: Mein Vater bist du”. Diese Ähnlichkeit kann kaum Zufall sein. Selbst Weiss, der wie gesehen die Inthronisationsthese vertritt, sieht sich unter diesem Argument genötigt, bei πρωτότοκος in Hebr 1,6 auf Ps^{LXX} 88,28 zu verweisen; er erkennt mit Recht einen Motivzusammenhang von VV.2.5.6 und versteht unter πρωτότοκος gemäss einer an die LXX angelehnten Messianologie den Erstgeborenen als messianischen König⁸¹. Die Anlehnung von πρωτότοκος in Hebr 1,6 an Ps^{LXX} 88,28 schliesst dann auch die von Andriessen postulierte Verknüpfung mit Dtn 6,10 bzw. 11,29 und seine These der typologisch interpretierten Einführung Israels in das verheissene (himmlische) Land aus⁸². Wenn nun der *auctor ad Hebraeos* in Hebr 1,6 im Erstgeborenen nach Ps 89,28 den “Höchsten der Könige der Erde” sieht (vgl. die Parallele in Offb 1,5⁸³), dann spricht dies sehr dafür, dass er mit dessen εἰσαγωγή in die οἰκουμένη die Parusie Christi vor Augen hatte, die ihn als Erben aller Königreiche und Weltherrscher offenbaren wird⁸⁴. Dass der Hebr neben der primären Bedeutung des Erstgeborenen als Allerben und Weltherrscher möglicherweise auch noch weitere Bedeutungen im Blick hatte, wie z. B. die “einzigartige Nähe des Sohnes zum Vater”⁸⁵ oder dessen

⁸¹ Vgl. WEISS, *Hebräer*, 163. Den Bezug von Hebr 1,6 zu Ps^{LXX} 88,28 sehen z. B. auch MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 113f; PFITZNER, *Hebrews*, 54; MCKNIGHT, *Hebrews*, 48 und THOMPSON, *Hebrews*, 54.

⁸² Die These ist auch inhaltlich (οἰκουμένη ist in Hebr 1,6 nicht das [verheissene] himmlische Land, siehe oben) und sprachlich (πρωτότοκος statt σε, οἰκουμένη statt γῆ und die Ergänzung von πάλιν sind m. E. zu viele angenommene Veränderungen) nur schwer haltbar.

⁸³ Jesus Christus wird an dieser Stelle als ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς bezeichnet, was offenbar eine Anlehnung an Ps^{LXX} 88,28 darstellt.

⁸⁴ Siehe auch HOFIUS, *Christushymnus*, 91f.96.

⁸⁵ Vgl. BACKHAUS, *Hebräer*, 97.

Präexistenz ⁸⁶, spricht nicht gegen die Parusieinterpretation von Hebr 1,6. Selbst die von Grässer postulierte Bedeutung des Erstgeborenen als Vorläufer und Erlöser würde es nicht tun ⁸⁷. Denn auch wenn die Erhöhung des Sohnes für die Erlösung der Gläubigen eine wichtige Rolle gespielt hat (vgl. dessen himmlischer Hohepriester- und Opferdienst nach Hebr 4,14; 7,26-27; 8,1-2; 9,11-15 u. a.), so ist nach Hebr 9,28 die vollständige σωτηρία offenkundig in der Wiederkunft des Christus auf der Erde verankert ⁸⁸.

* *

*

Als Fazit der Auswertung steht für mich fest, dass vieles (v. a. ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ als *futurum exactum*, οἰκουμένη als irdisch-bewohnte Welt und πρωτότοκος als Allerbe und Weltherrscher) für die Interpretation von Hebr 1,6a als Einführung des Sohnes in den irdisch-sichtbaren Raum bei seiner Parusie spricht.

Staatsunabhängige
Theologische Hochschule Basel
Mühlestiegrain 50
CH-4125 Riehen/Basel

Lukas STOLZ

SUMMARY

The meaning of the firstborn's εἰσαγωγή into the οἰκουμένη in Hebrews 1,6a is greatly disputed. Proposed interpretations are the presentation of the Son after the creation, his incarnation, his baptism, his exaltation and his parousia. The arguments seem to speak for the last-mentioned and against the currently very popular exaltation reading.

⁸⁶ Im Sinne von Kol 1,15 und dem πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (vgl. z. B. HEGERMANN, *Hebräer*, 53).

⁸⁷ Vgl. GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 78.

⁸⁸ Zur Widerlegung einer von EISELE postulierten rein individuellen Parusie Christi beim Tod der Gläubigen (*Unerschütterliches Reich*, 66–85) siehe Th. WITULSKI, "Zur Frage des Verhältnisses der Dimensionen von Raum und Zeit in der Konzeption der Eschatologie des Hebräerbriefes", *BZ* 51 (2007) 178f.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Die Bedeutung von 666 und 616 (Offb 13,18) ¹

I. Die Schreibweise von Zahlen im 1. Jh. n. Chr.

“Wer Verstand hat, berechne die Zahl des Tieres” (Offb 13,18). Der Seher Johannes will damit wohl sagen, dass nicht jeder, der Lesen und Schreiben kann, auch in der Lage ist, das Rätsel zu lösen. Er wendet sich an Absolventen der “höheren Schulen” seiner Zeit, die auf Grund ihrer Ausbildung das Rüstzeug zum Lösen des Rätsels haben sollten. Der Lehrplan solcher Schulen ist uns heute nicht mehr genau bekannt, aber auch die Berechnung des Kalenders dürfte ein wichtiger Unterrichtsgegenstand gewesen sein.

Das Jahr bei den Juden war ein Mondjahr und hatte ungefähr 354 Tage, war also um 11 Tage kürzer als ein Sonnenjahr. Um trotzdem die großen Jahresfeste zur richtigen Zeit zu feiern, brauchte man Schalttage und Schaltzeiten, die für jedes Jahr neu berechnet wurden ². Das einzige Volk, das in den vorchristlichen Jahrhunderten über eine wissenschaftlich fundierte Kalender- und Zeitrechnung verfügte, waren die Babylonier; deren Wissen lernten die Juden während ihrer Gefangenschaft kennen und wohl auch schätzen. So ist es sehr wahrscheinlich, dass u. a. die jüdischen Beamten, die im Synedrium für den Kalender zuständig waren, bei ihren Rechnungen von den astronomischen Tabellen der Babylonier Gebrauch machten. Dazu war aber die Kenntnis der babylonischen Schreibweise von Zahlen notwendig. Dieses Wissen ist auch heute noch die Voraussetzung zur Berechnung der Zahl des Tieres ³.

Die babylonische oder “sexagesimale Schreibweise” von Zahlen ist immer noch, wenn auch nur mehr rudimentär, bei uns zu finden. Wir gebrauchen sie, wenn wir Zeiten oder Zeitabstände in Stunden, Minuten und Sekunden angeben. Im dekadischen System gibt es zehn verschiedenen Ziffern (0-9), in Analogie dazu würde man im sexagesimalen System sechzig verschiedene Ziffern brauchen (0-59). Da diese nicht vorhanden sind, werden die sexagesimalen Ziffern mit zweistelligen, dekadischen

¹ Diese Arbeit ist eine Weiterführung und Ergänzung der Veröffentlichung: K. KIRCHMAYR, “Das sexagesimale System als Schlüssel zu Zahlen in der Offenbarung des Johannes”, *SNTU* 35 (2010) 35-50.

² P. VOLZ, *Die Biblischen Altertümer* (Tübingen 1914) 438.

³ Auch griechische Astronomen verwendeten das sexagesimale System der Babylonier bei der Darstellung von Bruchteilen einer Zahl. Vgl.: T. HEATH, *A History of Greek Mathematics* (New York 1981) I, 44-45.

Zahlen geschrieben. Eine Zeitangabe z. B. 26:40 (26 Minuten und 40 Sekunden) ist eine sexagesimale Zahl, die man in der Mathematik "26,40" schreibt. Sie hat zwei Stellen, an der ersten Stelle steht die Ziffer 26, an der zweiten die Ziffer 40. Die Ziffernsumme der sexagesimalen Zahl "26,40" ist $26 + 40 = 66$, ihr Wert ist $26 \cdot 60 + 40 = 1600$. Kleinere Zahlen als 216.000 lassen sich leicht sexagesimal schreiben, wenn man annimmt, es handle sich um Sekunden, die in eine Zeitangabe der Form "Stunden,Minuten,Sekunden" zu bringen sind. Letzteres ist die gesuchte, sexagesimale Schreibweise der gegebenen Zahl.

II. Name, Zahl und Betrag

Die Verwendung von Buchstaben als Ziffern brachte es mit sich, dass man viele Buchstabenfolgen auch als sexagesimale Zahlen lesen konnte ⁴. Letzteres haben Fachleute bis jetzt übersehen, sonst wäre das Rätsel in Offb 13,18 schon längst gelöst worden ⁵. So ist es möglich, einer Folge von Buchstaben nicht nur einen, sondern mindestens zwei Werte zuzuordnen, eine Zahl und einen Betrag. Die Zahl ist die Summe der Werte der Buchstaben und der Betrag ist das Ergebnis der Umrechnung der Buchstabenfolge in eine sexagesimale Zahl. Ein Beispiel soll dies verdeutlichen.

Der Name Adam wird mit griechischen Buchstaben ΑΔΑΜ geschrieben. Die Summe 46 der Werte der Buchstaben ist die Zahl dieses Namens ⁶. Den Namen kann man auch anders lesen, z. B. "ΑΔ ΑΜ" ⁷. Jetzt haben wir eine zweistellige, sexagesimale Zahl vor uns, deren Ziffernsumme 46 die Zahl des Namens Adam ist. Dies ist selbstverständlich, denn bei der Lesung als sexagesimale Zahl werden die Werte der Buchstaben selbst nicht verändert, nur die Stelle, an der sie stehen, erhält einen neuen Wert. Die erste Stelle ganz links könnte die Dimension Minuten haben, die zweite die Dimension Sekunden. Um den Betrag der sexagesimalen Zahl zu ermitteln, muss man die Minuten in Sekunden umrechnen und zu den vorhandenen Sekunden addieren, die Summe beträgt 341 ⁸. Der Name ΑΔΑΜ hat die Zahl 46 und bei dieser Lesung als sexagesimale Zahl den Betrag 341.

⁴ Nur Buchstabenfolgen, die keine Zahlzeichen mit einem größeren Wert als 59 enthalten, kann man als sexagesimale Zahlen schreiben.

⁵ Bei meiner Literaturrecherche konnte ich keine fremde Arbeit finden, in der zur Interpretation von Zahlen das sexagesimale System verwendet wird.

⁶ $A = 1, \Delta = 4, M = 40. A + \Delta + A + M = 1 + 4 + 1 + 40 = 46$.

⁷ Die Stellen einer sexagesimalen Zahl wurden durch größere Abstände der Ziffern voneinander getrennt.

⁸ $(A + \Delta) \text{ Minuten} + (A + M) \text{ Sekunden} = 5 \text{ Minuten} + 41 \text{ Sekunden} = 5 \cdot 60 \text{ Sekunden} + 41 \text{ Sekunden} = 341 \text{ Sekunden}$.

Das Interessante ist nun, dass man aus dem gegebenen Betrag die Zahl des Namens Adam errechnen kann, ohne den Namen selbst zu kennen. Man schreibt den Betrag 341 als sexagesimale Zahl 05,41 und addiert die Ziffern, die Summe der sexagesimalen Ziffern 5 und 41 ist die Zahl des Namens Adam 46. Die Berechnung der Zahl eines Namens aus einem gegebenen Betrag ist keine gematrische, sondern eine mathematische Prozedur.

III. Zahlen des Tieres für 666 und 616 (Offb 13,18)

“Hier ist Weisheit! Wer Verstand hat, berechne die Zahl des Tieres;
denn es ist eine Menschenzahl, und seine Zahl
ist sechshundertsechszig”⁹.

Nach dem oben Gesagten ist die Berechnung der Zahl des Tieres sehr einfach. Die Zahlen 666 und 616 sind Beträge, die als sexagesimale Zahlen geschrieben werden. Die Ziffernsumme der sexagesimalen Zahlen ist die gesuchte Zahl des Tieres.

Die sexagesimale Schreibweise von 666 ist = “11,06”¹⁰, die Zahl des Tieres ist 11 + 6 = 17. Erst jetzt kommt die Gematrie ins Spiel. Die Zahl 17 kann eine Zahl des Namens Tetragramms sein. Die Verknüpfung von Zahlen mit Buchstaben war bei den Juden nicht einheitlich, so konnte der Buchstabe Jod nicht nur den Wert 10, sondern auch den Wert 1 annehmen, dann ist 17 die Zahl des Namens Tetragramms¹¹.

Um 666 zu erhalten, ist der Seher Johannes nicht vom Namen JHWH direkt, sondern von dessen Spiegelbild Tetragramm ausgegangen. Name und Spiegelbild haben beide die Zahl 17 aber nicht die gleichen Beträge, nur bei letzterem führt die sexagesimale Interpretation auf den Betrag 666¹².

Zur Berechnung der Zahl des Tieres aus 616 schreibt man diese Zahl sexagesimal als 10,16 und addiert die Ziffern 10 und 16¹³. Ihre Summe 26 ist die gesuchte Zahl des Namens. Der bekannteste Name mit der Zahl 26 ist das Tetragramm¹⁴.

⁹ Neben 666 ist auch die Zahl 616 überliefert, die schon Irenäus bekannt war. Der Papyrus *P.Oxy. LXVI 4499* aus dem späten 3. oder frühen 4. Jh. n.Chr. enthält z. B. an Stelle von 666 die Zahl 616.

¹⁰ 11 Minuten und 6 Sekunden sind 666 Sekunden.

¹¹ H=5, W=6, J=1. Vgl.: F. DORNSEIF, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie* (ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ VII; Leipzig²1925) 100, Anm.2.

¹² “HW HJ” = (5+6)*60 + (5+1)*1 = “11,06” = 666.

¹³ 10 Minuten und 16 Sekunden = 616 Sekunden.

¹⁴ H=5, W=6, J=10.

III. Folgerungen

Die hier präsentierte Vorgehensweise bei der Berechnung der Zahl des Tieres ist vollkommen neu und entspricht der in Offb 13,18 gestellten Aufgabe. Es wurde die Zahl eines Namens ermittelt, ohne den Namen zu kennen, wie es der Imperativ "berechne die Zahl" im Text fordert. Das Ergebnis der Rechnung gibt die Zahl des Namens zurück, von dem der Seher Johannes bei der Erstellung des Rätsels ausgegangen ist, es ist der Gottesname und nicht der Name des Tieres. Namen gedeutet werden, sondern zur Umrechnung der genannten Zahlen in das sexagesimale System. Für die Richtigkeit der angestellten Überlegungen spricht, dass beide überlieferten Zahlen 666 und 616 sich auf den gleichen Namen zurückführen lassen.

Eine vollständige Lösung des Rätsels in Offb 13,18 scheint mir trotz der sicherlich "richtigen" Berechnung der Zahl des Tieres noch nicht vorzuliegen. Will Johannes mit diesem Rätsel wirklich nur darauf verweisen, dass die Zahl des Tieres identisch mit der Zahl des Gottesnamens ist oder sieht er noch andere Zusammenhänge? Ich weiß es nicht, denn mir ist nur der Verstand gegeben, die Zahl des Tieres zu berechnen, aber nicht die Weisheit, das Ergebnis zu erklären.

Am Pfarrersfeld 52
A-4840 Vöcklabruck

Karl KIRCHMAYR

SUMMARY

This short article deals with a particular method of calculating the number of the beast (Rev 13,18) without knowing a name. The mathematical procedure consists of converting a given number into a sexagesimal number and adding its digits. The number calculated for the beast is equal to the number of the Tetragrammaton.

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

In attesa di un paradigma condiviso: commentari a *Esodo*

Da quando — a partire dagli Anni Settanta del secolo scorso — l'ipotesi documentaria ha cessato di rappresentare il paradigma condiviso circa l'origine del Pentateuco, continua il dibattito circa i termini più adeguati per render ragione della formazione dei primi cinque libri del canone biblico.

All'interno di tale dibattito, va crescendo, nella sensibilità degli studiosi, l'avvertenza di non elaborare ipotesi diacroniche sull'intera sezione privilegiando, di fatto, uno solo dei libri in questione (di fatto, nel caso dell'ipotesi documentaria, *Genesi*). Il che spiega, negli ultimi decenni, la crescente attenzione per le stratificazioni diacroniche rilevabili anche in libri precedentemente meno considerati (in special modo, *Numeri*) o, comunque, differenti dal libro d'esordio.

Nel frattempo, negli ultimi decenni si è stemperata la contrapposizione tra i fautori di un approccio esclusivamente sincronico ai testi biblici e i sostenitori di una necessaria considerazione della loro dimensione diacronica, spesso a favore della opportuna complementarità degli approcci. In questo quadro complessivo, consideriamo tre commentari pubblicati in questi ultimi tre anni e dedicati a *Esodo*, libro quanto mai significativo per la fede biblica. Ci soffermiamo sulla presentazione dei primi due, mettendo a confronto le loro opzioni diacroniche, per poi passare alla presentazione del terzo e, infine, concludere con il raffronto su una questione specifica.

I. Il commentario di R. Albertz ¹

Autore del primo commentario in esame è Rainer Albertz, professore emerito di Antico Testamento presso la Facoltà di Teologia Evangelica dell'Università di Münster, celebre per i suoi studi sulla storia, la letteratura, la religione e la teologia dell'Israele biblico. Quanto a sensibilità esegetica, Albertz è annoverato tra gli esponenti della cosiddetta "scuola di Heidelberg" (insieme a R. Rendtorff, F. Crüsemann, E. Blum ...).

L'opera si presenta come un commentario di alto profilo, di taglio eminentemente storico-critico, attento però ad articolare in modo adeguato considerazioni di ordine sincronico e di ordine diacronico. La bibliografia, circoscritta ma puntuale e significativa, testimonia il confronto con le principali opere pertinenti e con le voci rilevanti del dibattito in corso.

¹ R. ALBERTZ, *Exodus*. Band I: Ex 1–18 (ZBK.AT 2.1; Zürich 2012).

1. *L'articolazione dell'opera*

Il volume si suddivide tra una significativa introduzione (pagine 11-37), il commento puntuale di Esodo 1-18 (39-314; per il commento alla seconda del libro biblico si attende un successivo volume) e alcune utili appendici (315-319: lo schema dell'ipotizzato modello di composizione del Pentateuco, la bibliografia e la tavola delle abbreviazioni).

Nell'introduzione, Albertz si sofferma, dapprima, ad inquadrare il libro dell'*Esodo* nella cornice del Pentateuco e dell'Esateuco, a considerarne la struttura e a motivare l'opportunità di un'adeguata articolazione della lettura sincronica e della lettura diacronica del libro, senza improprie contrapposizioni; per passare, poi, ad ipotizzare il processo di formazione del libro, ad esplorare la consistenza storica degli avvenimenti in esso narrati e ad illustrare, infine, l'impianto del commentario stesso.

Nel commento di Esodo 1-18, l'Autore procede mediante la considerazione di unità circoscritte. Di ciascuna si fornisce la traduzione (segnalando nella forma grafica la stratificazione diacronica), si rileva la struttura sia interna che in rapporto al contesto (prevalgono in questi passaggi considerazioni di ordine sincronico), si argomenta la possibile attribuzione diacronica dei segmenti in esame, per passare poi al commento vero e proprio riccamente articolato tra attenzione al dato lessicale, allo sviluppo narrativo e alle connessioni letterarie e teologiche di più ampio respiro. All'interno del commento sono inseriti una quarantina di brevi e utili *excursus*, puntualmente segnalati nell'indice iniziale.

2. *L'ipotesi diacronica proposta*

Prendendo le distanze dall'ipotesi documentaria classica, Albertz ipotizza all'origine del Pentateuco una serie di unità letterarie indipendenti, successivamente rielaborate in forme narrative più ampie, accresciute poi mediante interventi redazionali. Pur riconoscendo l'esigenza di ulteriori approfondimenti, l'Autore ritiene che, perlomeno in Esodo 1-18, possano essere riconosciuti i seguenti strati letterari, risalenti ad epoche differenti: la "composizione dell'esodo" (K^{EX}, *die Exoduskomposition*); la prima elaborazione sacerdotale (PB¹, *die erste priesterliche Bearbeitung*); la seconda elaborazione sacerdotale (PB², *die zweite priesterliche Bearbeitung*); la redazione post-deuteronomistica (D, *die spät-deuteronomistische Redaktion*); la terza elaborazione sacerdotale (PB³, *die dritte priesterliche Bearbeitung*); la "redazione dell'angelo" (MalR, *die Mal'ak-Redaktion*); la redazione dell'Esateuco (HexR, *die Hexateuchredaktion*); redazioni post-sacerdotali del Pentateuco (provvisoriamente PB⁴ e PB⁵, *spätpriesterliche Pentateuchredaktionen*)².

² Per una presentazione sintetica delle diverse stratificazioni (materiali loro attribuiti, datazione, eventuale ruolo rispetto al resto del Pentateuco) ri-

L'ipotesi diacronica prospettata da Albertz si colloca in linea con quanti vedono nel riferimento alle antiche ipotesi dei frammenti e ipotesi dei complementi il modello più adeguato per render ragione del processo di composizione del Pentateuco: in particolare, è riconoscibile la sua appartenenza alla "scuola di Heidelberg". Ponendosi in modo originale in questa linea, l'Autore è attento a riconoscere le possibili antiche tradizioni sottese alla narrazione di Esodo 1-18, l'origine autonoma della tradizione dell'esodo, la sua articolazione con le storie delle origini e le storie patriarcali ad opera della tradizione sacerdotale, le numerose rielaborazioni redazionali avvenute in epoca post-esilica.

3. Possibili rilievi critici

Pur senza negare il valore dell'ipotesi abbozzata e riconoscendo che essa rappresenterà necessariamente un significativo termine di confronto per il dibattito futuro, si possono accennare, a titolo esemplificativo, un paio di questioni che sembrano richiedere ulteriori riscontri o approfondimenti.

a) La datazione della "composizione dell'esodo" (K^{EX}) in tarda epoca esilica è motivata dalla sua configurazione quale "*Sündenfallgeschichte*" di Israele, in base alla sua delimitazione in Esodo 1-34*³. Si tratta di verificare l'effettiva consistenza di tale composizione e di tale delimitazione e, in caso di valutazioni differenti, di riconsiderare l'effettiva consistenza delle tradizioni sull'esodo (frammenti, articolazione narrativa minima variamente delimitabile?) prima della loro incardinazione nello scritto sacerdotale e la loro datazione. Detto diversamente: datazione tardo-esilica e inclusione dell'episodio del vitello d'oro nella composizione ipotizzata si poggiano anche su altri argomenti o rischiano di rappresentare una *petitio principii*?

b) Tra l'elaborazione unitaria delle tradizioni antiche operata dalla tradizione sacerdotale e la forma finale del Pentateuco, intervenne una consistente e significativa attività redazionale: pur nella diversità delle valutazioni specifiche, si tratta di una consapevolezza sostanzialmente comune. Restano, invece, oggetto di dibattito questioni quali l'estensione originaria dello scritto sacerdotale, i rapporti tra *Genesi-Esodo* e la composizione dei tre libri successivi, nonché la loro connessione con i libri dell'opera storica deuteronomistica. Su tale quadro di fondo della ricerca in corso, stante la modesta estensione di alcuni interventi redazionali ipotizzati da Albertz (in particolare, nel caso di PB², PB³, MalR,

mandiamo a ALBERTZ, *Exodus 1-18*, 19-26, e al prospetto sintetico di ALBERTZ, *Exodus 1-18*, 315.

³ Cf. ALBERTZ, *Exodus 1-18*, 20.

PB⁴ e PB⁵), ci si può chiedere se i presunti intendimenti ideologici e le caratteristiche letterarie riconoscibili nei materiali ipotizzati trovino effettivo riscontro in altri libri del Pentateuco e consentano il riconoscimento di specifiche attività redazionali di ampio respiro o non si debba, almeno in alcuni casi, ipotizzare interventi dall'orizzonte ideologico e letterario più circoscritto, non necessariamente implicati nelle possibili tappe di elaborazione di quello che risultò, infine, il Pentateuco.

II. Il commentario di H. Utzschneider e di W. Oswald ⁴

Il secondo commentario in esame rappresenta il volume d'esordio di una nuova collana, l'*Internationaler Exegetischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament* (IEKAT), che si pone l'ambizioso obiettivo di coinvolgere nel commento dei libri veterotestamentari esegeti di differente appartenenza confessionale o religiosa e di differenti aree geografiche, auspicando tra l'altro il superamento della contrapposizione tra letture sincroniche e letture diacroniche dei testi.

Emblematica di quest'ultima istanza è la scelta di affidare il commento di *Esodo* (di cui questo primo volume dei due previsti si limita ai capitoli 1–15) a due studiosi — l'uno esperto di analisi di tipo sincronico, l'altro impegnato in ricerche di taglio storico-critico — al fine di favorire l'interazione dei piani. Attento al piano sincronico è Helmut Utzschneider, professore di Antico Testamento presso la *Augustana-Hochschule* in Neuendettelsau, mentre impegnato negli studi sulla diacronia del Pentateuco (e di *Esodo* in particolare) è Wolfgang Oswald, professore di Antico Testamento presso la Facoltà di Teologia Evangelica dell'Università di Tübingen.

Anche questo commentario si presenta come opera di rilievo, l'analisi è condotta in costante confronto con una bibliografia cospicua e significativa. La compresenza di prospettiva sincronica e prospettiva diacronica, che di per sé rappresenta uno dei pregi del volume, viene a risultare tuttavia non del tutto soddisfacente laddove sortisce un loro semplice accostamento e non un'effettiva interazione. Altro limite rilevabile nell'opera è la scelta di delimitare questo primo volume a *Esodo* 1–15, per plausibili valutazioni di ordine sincronico e diacronico: ciò impedisce talvolta un'opportuna considerazione complessiva dei contenuti del libro biblico.

1. L'articolazione dell'opera

Il volume si articola in un'ampia introduzione (pagine 17–55), nell'approfondito commento di *Esodo* 1–15 (57–345) e una serie di utili indici (347–370: abbreviazioni e sigle; strumenti fondamentali; bibliografia;

⁴ H. UTZSCHNEIDER – W. OSWALD, *Exodus 1–15* (IEKAT; Stuttgart 2013).

parole ebraiche; indice tematico; indice delle citazioni). Nella presentazione dei contenuti, l'intera opera è utilmente corredata di occhiali che ne facilitano alquanto la lettura.

L'introduzione è suddivisa nettamente in due parti, differenti sia per la prospettiva considerata (sincronica nella prima, diacronica nella seconda) sia per l'oggetto in esame (il racconto dell'esodo nella prima, il libro dell'Esodo nella seconda). Nella prima parte, dopo aver considerato il rilievo estetico-letterario della spiegazione sincronica, si passa a considerare il racconto dell'esodo all'interno delle tradizioni narrative dell'Antico Testamento (Genesi–2 Re), per verificare poi questo racconto come unità narrativa (mettendo a fuoco inizio, conclusione, tratti stilistici; e a seguire, struttura e intreccio con le loro varie articolazioni e connotazioni). Sempre in questa prima parte, si conclude prestando attenzione ai temi e alle intenzioni del racconto biblico dell'esodo: la valenza politico-teologica, la funzione di leggenda culturale della festa di Pasqua-Azzimi, il suo significato di "racconto-*rhilla*". Nella seconda parte dell'introduzione, dedicata ad ipotizzare il processo di formazione del libro dell'Esodo, oltre ad articolarne le diverse fasi compositive (cf. *infra*), lo studio si sofferma a delineare il senso di un'analisi di tipo diacronico, a offrire una sintesi della ricerca moderna sul libro, a porre la questione del genere letterario preminente, ad invitare a necessaria consapevolezza circa le possibilità di recuperare l'effettiva consistenza storica dei fatti narrati e circa la necessità di cogliere gli aspetti simbolici della loro presentazione.

Coerentemente con l'articolazione narrativa rilevata in sede di introduzione, il commento al testo si occupa del prologo (Es 1,1-7) e delle successive sei fasi narrative (*Erzählphasen*), ciascuna suddivisa in eventuali cicli e in episodi. Accanto a introduzioni più o meno articolate alle singole fasi narrative (con le loro problematiche specifiche), ogni episodio vede considerazioni su testo e traduzione, l'analisi sincronica, l'analisi diacronica e una sintesi conclusiva che mira a porre in dialogo i due precedenti sguardi prospettici.

2. L'ipotesi diacronica proposta

Per quanto riguarda la diacronia di *Esodo*, gli Autori ipotizzano cinque passaggi che hanno portato alla configurazione attuale: l'antica narrazione dell'esodo; la "narrazione dell'esodo e del monte di Dio" (*EG-Erzählung, die Exodus-Gottesberg-Erzählung*); l'opera storica deuteronomistica (*DtrG*); la composizione sacerdotale (*P-Komposition*); la "composizione della Torah" (*die Tora-Komposition*)⁵.

⁵ Per un quadro delle diverse stratificazioni (materiali loro attribuiti, datazione, ideologia, eventuale interazione rispetto al resto del Pentateuco o delle tradizioni narrative dell'antico Israele) rimandiamo a UTZSCHNEIDER – OSWALD, *Exodus 1–15*, 41-54.

Anche in questo caso, l'ipotesi avanzata circa la composizione del libro dell'*Esodo* si discosta dal modello dell'ipotesi documentaria e assume il paradigma dell'ipotesi dei complementi: di passaggio in passaggio l'antico racconto dell'esodo si trova inserito (con le debite integrazioni) in contesti letterari viepiù ampi e/o diversamente connotati da un punto di vista di rilievo teologico complessivo. In tal modo viene evidenziata l'origine autonoma e il valore politico dell'antica tradizione dell'esodo; la prima espansione con i contenuti legali e istituzionali connessi all'alleanza al Sinai; il collegamento con la teologia deuteronomistica (una teologia chiaramente connotata: emblematiche, al riguardo, sono l'inserzione dell'episodio del vitello d'oro e la connessione con la prospettiva della presa di possesso della terra); il rilevante contributo della tradizione sacerdotale, soprattutto per il collegamento con le precedenti storie di Genesi e per l'aggiunta di istanze tipicamente sacerdotali, *in primis* l'elemento del santuario mobile; una serie di inserzioni redazionali attinenti il rilievo della figura di Mosè nel momento della delimitazione finale del Pentateuco in quanto tale.

3. Possibili rilievi critici

Il modello diacronico offerto circa la formazione di Esodo risulta ponderato e meritevole di attenzione e discussione. Tuttavia, senza entrare nel merito dell'attribuzione dei singoli segmenti, alcune osservazioni circa l'impianto complessivo possono essere avanzate in vista di ulteriori approfondimenti.

a) I termini ipotizzati circa l'interazione tra tradizioni dell'esodo e opera storica deuteronomistica destano qualche perplessità. Infatti, quali indicatori si hanno, nel testo, di un'interazione che, in tale opera, vada oltre i libri del Deuteronomio e di Giosuè o che, in Esodo, ponga riferimenti a elementi di libri successivi a questi due (Giudici-2 Re)? Inoltre, l'interazione tra tradizione deuteronomistica e tradizione sacerdotale si pone in termini di compromesso⁶ o in termini di reinterpretazione e integrazione dei contenuti e della delimitazione della prima da parte della seconda (come si lascia intravedere nel volume in esame)?

b) La composizione sacerdotale (cui è attribuita la prima connessione tra Genesi ed Esodo) è datata verso la metà del IV secolo. Perché abbassare così tanto l'elaborazione di testi fondamentali per la comprensione del mondo, dell'identità e delle istituzioni di Israele (si pensi a

⁶ Come prospettato da E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984), e da E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin – New York 1990).

Genesi 1; 6–9; 17; Esodo 25–40) e la loro configurazione unitaria con le vicende dell'esodo, in un'epoca così distante da quell'esilio che rappresentò un momento decisivo per la maturazione della fede monoteistica e dei termini identitari dell'Israele biblico? Altro interrogativo è legato all'estensione della composizione P, che secondo il nostro volume arriverebbe fino alla fine del libro di *Giosuè*. Se l'individuazione della fine dello scritto P rimane dibattuta, occorre riconoscere che tale delimitazione non rientra tra le ipotesi dibattute: infatti, è piuttosto comunemente riconosciuto il carattere non solo post-deuteronomistico, ma anche post-sacerdotale sia di pericopi quali Gs 24,1-28 sia di segmenti quali Gn 50,24-25; Es 13,19 e Gs 24,32, tra le poche connessioni che toccano gli estremi del cosiddetto "Esateuco"⁷. Infine, stante il crescente riconoscimento, all'interno degli studi sul Pentateuco, della consistenza dell'attività redazionale post-sacerdotale, la datazione così tardiva della composizione P non obbliga a comprimere tale attività in un arco di tempo inverosimilmente ristretto?

c) Ogni passaggio ipotizzato alla base della formazione del libro dell'Esodo porta con sé l'integrazione di materiale consistente e di semplici aggiunte redazionali rispetto alla forma precedente: il che sembra indicare che tutti gli interventi redazionali siano collocati dentro elaborazioni ideologiche e letterarie di ampio respiro. Senza negare che talvolta così possa essere, è forse verosimile ipotizzare che, soprattutto nelle fasi più tardive, una serie di interventi redazionali abbiano avuto orizzonti più circoscritti, sia quanto a portata letteraria sia quanto a rilievo ideologico (come rilevabile anche all'interno di altri libri del Pentateuco⁸). Tale eventualità sembra non trovi diritto di cittadinanza nel nostro volume.

d) Infine, la scansione delle cinque tappe della formazione di Esodo (e, in parte, del Pentateuco) e la parallela delimitazione della stratificazione del testo sembra muoversi più nella logica della deduzione che in quella dell'induzione, che in esegesi dovrebbe essere prevalente. Talvolta si ha la sensazione che, invece di avanzare osservazioni complessive in base ai rilievi testuali, si determinino i diversi materiali testuali non in nome di effettive tensioni nella narrazione, bensì a partire dal quadro diacronico ipotizzato. L'impressione non pare dovuta soltanto all'inevitabile e comprensibile forma espositiva propria di un commentario. Così, per limitarsi a un esempio, se si considera l'analisi di un testo si-

⁷ Tra le altre, si vedano, al riguardo, le considerazioni di T.C. RÖMER – M.Z. BRETTLER, "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch", *JBL* 119 (2000) 401-419.

⁸ Circa la varietà e la differente consistenza dell'attività redazionale nel Pentateuco, cf. J.-L. SKA, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (Winona Lake, IN 2006) 76-95.

gnificativo come Esodo 14, si ha la sensazione che la valutazione dei vv. 16a e 31aßb come tardivi (appartenenti alla cosiddetta *Tora-Komposition*) non dipenda da effettive incongruenze testuali, ma dalla determinazione aprioristica del carattere tardivo del rilievo di alcuni aspetti concernenti Mosè (in particolare del bastone del suo comando e della fede nella sua figura)⁹.

4. *Accenni di comparazione dei due modelli diacronici*

Pur nell'inevitabile incertezza che, in assenza di un paradigma condiviso, segna la presente stagione degli studi sulla composizione del Pentateuco, e stante le differenze delle ipotesi avanzate circa la formazione del libro dell'Esodo da parte di Albertz e da parte di (Utzschneider e) Oswald, è significativo rilevare la loro convergenza su alcune prospettive di fondo.

Comune alle proposte avanzate è la presa di distanza dal paradigma dell'ipotesi documentaria a favore del modello dei complementi e, in parte, dei frammenti; la collocazione in epoca persiana della maggior parte dei passaggi significativi per la composizione del libro dell'Esodo e del Pentateuco; l'attribuzione alla tradizione sacerdotale della prima articolazione tra le tradizioni di Genesi e quelle di Esodo.

Passando a una valutazione complessiva, pur nella consapevolezza del carattere parziale dei due volumi e in attesa del completamento di entrambi, come pure in attesa di ulteriori verifiche e approfondimenti, la proposta di Albertz circa la composizione di *Esodo* sembra presentare maggiori elementi di plausibilità rispetto a quella di Utzschneider e Oswald. A fronte di una plausibile linearità della prima (stanti i rilievi avanzati), della seconda non pare convincente *in primis* il collegamento della narrazione dell'esodo con l'intera opera storica deuteronomistica, come pure il carattere così tardivo della composizione sacerdotale e la sua estensione a Esateuco.

III. Il commentario di V.P. Hamilton¹⁰

Il terzo commentario che possiamo ad esaminare proviene, a differenza dei precedenti, dal contesto statunitense. Ne è autore Victor Paul Hamilton, professore emerito di Bibbia e Teologia presso l'*Asbury University*, in Wilmore (Kentucky).

⁹ Si vedano, più dettagliatamente, le considerazioni presenti in UTZSCHNEIDER – OSWALD, *Exodus 1–15*, 52–54, 325.

¹⁰ V.P. HAMILTON, *Exodus. An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI 2011).

1. *Impostazione dell'opera*

Il commentario pone l'analisi su un piano esclusivamente sincronico. L'introduzione vera e propria (di sole nove pagine) è limitata ad una rassegna complessiva dei contenuti narrativi e teologici del libro dell'Esodo. Il commento vero e proprio del libro biblico si estende per ben 621 pagine ed è suddiviso in sette parti, non corrispondenti peraltro alle quindici individuate in sede introduttiva (xxviii-xxix). Al termine del volume trovano spazio l'abbondante bibliografia (esclusivamente in lingua inglese) citata, l'indice degli autori, quello delle citazioni e quello tematico.

Risulta apprezzabile il fatto che, complessivamente, il commentario dedichi anche alla seconda parte di Esodo, abitualmente oggetto di minor considerazione, la medesima attenzione riservata alla prima: il che riflette la consapevolezza, ben espressa in sede introduttiva, che il tema della liberazione non esaurisce l'interesse del libro biblico, altrettanto attento ai temi dell'alleanza con Dio e dell'allestimento della dimora divina in mezzo al suo popolo.

Il commento delle singole pericopi offre abbondanza di osservazioni grammaticali e lessicali, anche in collegamento con la traduzione proposta, e accumula osservazioni di ordine descrittivo, sia su singoli lessemi o singole tematiche, in confronto sia con i dati veterotestamentari che con quelli neotestamentari. Il riferimento storico, anche a motivo della scelta sincronica di fondo, si limita a comparare—quando possibile—determinati passi con opere delle culture limitrofe.

2. *Osservazioni critiche*

Il prevalere di osservazioni di ordine descrittivo (lo stesso livello cui sembra attestarsi la pur cospicua considerazione del dibattito esegetico) lascia la sensazione di rimanere sulla superficie del testo, senza entrare effettivamente in alcun nodo del suo sviluppo. Pur tralasciando osservazioni di ordine diacronico, maggiori attenzioni avrebbero meritato, ad esempio, considerazioni di ordine narrativo circa l'insieme del libro e circa le singole sezioni (articolazione della trama, lettore implicato, caratterizzazione dei personaggi ...), che invece non trovano spazio nella trattazione ¹¹.

Per non limitarsi che a un esempio di tale approccio di Hamilton, possiamo considerare il commento al comandamento del sabato presente in Es 20,8-11 ¹². Gran parte delle osservazioni sono dedicate a recuperare tutto ciò che l'Antico Testamento afferma circa l'osservanza del sabato o

¹¹ A questo riguardo, è eloquente la differenza qualitativa rispetto alle considerazioni sincroniche presenti nel volume di Utzschneider e Oswald: si veda anche solamente UTZSCHNEIDER – OSWALD, *Exodus 1–15*, 23-33.

¹² Cf. HAMILTON, *Exodus*, 337-340.

istituzioni religiose correlate, come pure a valutare in prospettiva cristiana il significato di tale osservanza a partire dalle riflessioni neotestamentarie. Poca attenzione viene rilevata alla motivazione di tale osservanza: si evidenzia il collegamento con Gn 2,2-3, ma ci si limita a un piano descrittivo, senza interrogarsi sul rilievo teologico che tale prospettiva riserva al sabato stesso. Anche rispetto alla differente motivazione dell'osservanza sabbatica presente in Dt 5,15 (non la creazione, ma l'esodo), la preoccupazione è di sottolineare la compatibilità con quanto affermato in Es 20,11, non di evidenziare e confrontare la ricchezza di prospettive teologiche differenti. D'altronde, non ci si può attendere questo da chi, in precedenza, per risolvere le differenze tra le due versioni del decalogo (Es 20,2-17; Dt 5,6-21) afferma che il medesimo autore divino non era obbligato ad evitare variazioni e a presentare le sue richieste in fotocopia¹³; o, per spiegare le proibizioni del decalogo, si sofferma a compararlo con il regolamento di una piscina¹⁴.

Il tenore di tali affermazioni e, più complessivamente, dell'analisi esegetica condotta da Hamilton in questo volume vuole rispondere a uno degli intendimenti manifestati in sede di prefazione¹⁵: essere testo di riferimento per il ministero della Parola per quanti sono pastori nel popolo di Dio. Meno apprezzabile risulta, invece, il tenore del volume qualora — come detto nella medesima sede — si ritenga che esso debba essere parte del confronto accademico: fatte salve alcune osservazioni di ordine linguistico o alcune rassegne di citazioni su singole tematiche, non si comprende quale possa essere l'effettivo apporto del volume alla ricerca esegetica. Peraltro, ci si può chiedere se anche il servizio alla divulgazione pastorale, qualora non voglia ridursi a semplice ed abbondante rassegna di "spunti predicabili", non necessiti di approfondimenti (anche semplicemente a livello sincronico) di maggior consistenza.

IV. Un possibile tema di comparazione: l'articolazione del libro dell'Esodo

Stante la differente estensione di capitoli di Esodo considerati nei tre commentari e le differenti opzioni metodologiche in gioco, limitiamo il confronto comune ai tre commentari a un aspetto significativo per gli studi sul secondo libro del canone biblico: l'individuazione della sua articolazione. Si tratta, infatti, di una difficoltà tipica degli studi su questo libro biblico, che manca di evidenti segnali linguistici al riguardo e che

¹³ Così HAMILTON, *Exodus*, 315.

¹⁴ Così HAMILTON, *Exodus*, 316-317.

¹⁵ Il riferimento è a HAMILTON, *Exodus*, xi.

obbliga, pertanto, a considerazioni di ordine tematico. La struttura ipotizzata consente di aprire una finestra specifica sui tre commentari in esame, sufficientemente eloquente del loro differente modo di procedere.

1. *La proposta di Albertz*

R. Albertz ¹⁶ riconosce in Esodo due parti principali, dedicata l'una alla liberazione di Israele (capitoli 1–18) e l'altra all'obbligazione di Israele (capitoli 19–40). La prima parte è ulteriormente suddivisa tra 1,1 – 13,16 (liberazione dall'Egitto), 13,17 – 15,21 (salvezza al Mar delle Canne) e 15,22 – 18,27 (protezione e prova nel deserto). La seconda parte è a sua volta suddivisa in quattro sezioni: 19–24 (rivelazione dei comandamenti divini e stipulazione dell'alleanza), 25–31 (rivelazione del santuario e del suo arredo), 32–34 (apostasia da YHWH e rinnovo dell'alleanza), 35–40 (costruzione e allestimento del santuario in realizzazione delle disposizioni divine).

La proposta di Albertz rileva, effettivamente, le parti comunemente riconosciute nel libro e si preoccupa di evitarne la semplice giustapposizione, fornendo ampi motivi di plausibilità. Il che non impedisce di muovere qualche rilievo critico, fermi restando i generali termini di incertezza della questione.

1) La scansione in due parti non sembra render sufficientemente ragione della sezione di transizione di Es 15,22 – 18,27, che di per sé non attiene né alla liberazione di Israele né alla sua obbligazione al Sinai: pertanto, la collocazione nella prima parte non risulta del tutto convincente. Sempre all'interno della prima parte, inoltre, la suddivisione tra 1,1 – 13,16 e 13,17 – 15,21 pone uno stacco eccessivo (certo non equiparabile a quello tra 15,21 e 15,22) tra due parti strettamente connesse quanto a logica narrativa: l'episodio del miracolo del mare, infatti, è ancora implicato nel confronto duro e serrato tra YHWH e il faraone che ha contraddistinto i capitoli precedenti e ne rappresenta l'esito risolutivo.

2) Nella seconda parte, la tematica individuata — l'obbligazione di Israele — mentre ben concorre a delineare il significato dei capitoli 19–24 e 32–34, rischia di non rendere sufficientemente ragione del tema centrale dei capitoli 25–31 e 35–40, la dimora divina in mezzo al suo popolo. Questa non è tanto parte dell'obbligazione di Israele, quanto dell'implicazione di YHWH con la vicenda del suo popolo.

Pur riconoscendo alla proposta di Albertz di cogliere i passaggi significativi di Esodo, pare preferibile ricercare un'ipotesi di strutturazione

¹⁶ Cf. ALBERTZ, *Exodus 1–18*, 15–17.

che renda maggiormente ragione dell'articolazione delle singole sezioni, senza forzarle in una struttura bipartita non del tutto soddisfacente ¹⁷.

2. *La proposta di Utzschneider e Oswald*

H. Utzschneider e W. Oswald non affrontano la questione dell'articolazione complessiva del libro dell'*Esodo*, limitandosi a considerare quella del racconto dell'esodo racchiuso in 1,1 – 15,22 ¹⁸, oggetto del volume in esame. Tale delimitazione, in sé corretta quanto all'azione considerata, impedisce di cogliere eventuali connessioni tematiche con la parte successiva del libro biblico e, salvo diverse indicazioni nel secondo volume in programma, induce a ritenere che le diverse sezioni di Esodo siano percepite come semplicemente giustapposte, non articolate in alcun modo. In questo senso, sarebbe stato preferibile che gli Autori si fossero soffermati in sede introduttiva a considerare l'articolazione dell'intero libro dell'Esodo, al pari di quanto fatto (necessariamente) per le considerazioni di ordine diacronico.

All'interno della sezione considerata, gli Autori riconoscono un'articolazione in sei fasi narrative: 1,8 – 2,22 (gli Egiziani opprimono gli Israeliti con lavori servili; infanzia e giovinezza di Mosè); 2,23 – 6,1 (dal monte di Dio all'Egitto); 6,2 – 7,13 (YHWH lega la liberazione degli Israeliti al suo nome e invia nuovamente Mosè e Aronne dal faraone); 7,14 – 11,10 (il racconto delle piaghe); 12,1 – 13,16 (*Pesach-Massot* e la partenza degli Israeliti dall'Egitto); 13,17 – 15,21 (il racconto del miracolo del mare).

Pur riconoscendo la difficoltà di delineare in un'articolazione unitaria la varietà dei materiali presenti in questi quindici capitoli, la scansione proposta presenta alcuni, limitati motivi di perplessità. Intanto essa non evidenzia uno sviluppo tematico o narrativo: perlomeno a livello di titolazione non si puntualizza l'azione in gioco e, dunque, presupposti, complicazioni, sviluppo, esito conseguente, risoluzione. Tale mancata sottolineatura provoca, almeno in parte, la sensazione di un accostamento disomogeneo delle parti, senza che affiori il significato di ogni fase narrativa rispetto all'insieme. Così, se Es 2,23-25 rappresenta il vero e proprio inizio dell'azione, quanto precede dovrebbe essere configurato come premessa e forse sarebbe preferibile articolare diversamente alcuni passaggi genericamente accomunati nella fase 2,23 – 6,1. Inoltre, alcune delimitazioni sembrano richiedere valutazioni ulteriori: così, ad esempio, pare preferibile occorre riconoscere l'inizio del racconto delle piaghe in

¹⁷ Per un'ipotesi che sembra render maggiormente ragione dello sviluppo narrativo e tematico del libro dell'*Esodo*, rimandiamo a J.-L. SKA, "Le Livre de l'Exode. Questions fondamentales et questions ouvertes", *NRT* 133 (2011) 368-373.

¹⁸ Si veda UTZSCHNEIDER – OSWALD, *Exodus 1-15*, 23-32.

7,1, dal momento che 7,1-7 presenta il programma narrativo della sezione, mentre i vv. 8-13 presentano il segno preliminare.

3. La proposta di Hamilton

Ci soffermiamo, infine, a considerare l'articolazione dei contenuti di *Esodo* evidenziata da V.P. Hamilton¹⁹. Dopo aver citato, senza valutazione, le strutture proposte da C. Westermann (1967), M.S. Smith (1997), J.G. Janzen (1997) e T. Longman (2009) perché creative e interessanti, l'Autore passa alla sua proposta, scandita (anche dai termini in rima, che manteniamo in inglese) in quindici punti: *oppression* (1,1 – 2,25); *trepidation* (3,1 – 4,31); *rejection* (5,1-23); *reaffirmation* (6,1-30); *confrontation* (7,1 – 12,30); *liberation* (12,31 – 14,31); *celebration* (15,1-21); *itineration* (15,22 – 17,15); *administration* (18,1-27); *legislation* (19,1 – 24,18); *specifications* (25,1 – 31,18); *deviation* (32,1 – 33,23); *reconciliation* (34,1-35); *construction* (35,1 – 40,33); *glorification* (40,34-38).

Purtroppo, l'assenza di argomenti a sostegno della proposta impedisce al lettore una effettiva valutazione di essa: può soltanto accettarla o rifiutarla. In tal modo, si trasmette l'idea che il riconoscimento della strutturazione di un'opera letteraria antica possa rappresentare un fatto arbitrario, lasciato alla discrezione personale, mentre si tratta di un primo modo di fornire al lettore significative chiavi di lettura: si tratta, per così dire, di tentare di recuperare l'indice dell'opera (elemento assente nelle opere antiche), cioè la logica dell'articolazione dei contenuti. Una logica che non affiora dalla proposta di Hamilton, che pare limitarsi ad un piano genericamente descrittivo.

Guardando, poi, all'interno della proposta, talvolta si ha la sensazione di frammenti privi di orizzonti più ampi e pertinenti. Così, ad esempio, parlare di *confrontation* a proposito delle piaghe d'Egitto è certamente plausibile, però sottace totalmente la funzione "cognitiva" e "rivelatrice" delle piaghe. In Es 1,1 – 15,21, infatti, il confronto tra YHWH e il faraone si gioca in gran parte sul riconoscimento del primo da parte del secondo: si vedano, in questa linea, Es 5,2; 7,5 e le "formule di riconoscimento" presenti nel racconto delle piaghe e perfino in Es 14,4.18.25. In altri casi, si ha la sensazione di titoli non molto precisi. Così *specifications*, *construction* e *glorification* per le sezioni concernenti l'allestimento del santuario mobile risultano piuttosto generici e non sembrano render ragione adeguata dello spazio (tredici capitoli su quaranta) e dell'importanza che tale tematica riceve nello sviluppo del libro dell'Esodo e nella messa a punto dell'identità di Israele.

* *

*

¹⁹ Cf. HAMILTON, *Exodus*, xxvii-xxix.

Accanto a un volume (quello di Hamilton) di livello meno significativo, i commentari di Albertz e di Utzschneider e Oswald meritano considerazione e, specie se completati dal commento alla parte restante di Esodo, possono rappresentare un necessario riferimento per il dibattito esegetico sul secondo libro del Pentateuco, alla pari di altri commentari che in tempi passati o recenti hanno segnato gli studi al riguardo ²⁰.

Stanti le differenti declinazioni rilevate, è interessante riconoscere nei due volumi una convergenza di fondo su alcuni aspetti metodologici e su alcune valutazioni di merito. È apprezzabile il superamento, non solo in linea di principio, della contrapposizione tra approccio sincronico e approccio diacronico e della consapevolezza della necessità di una loro interazione.

Circa le ipotesi sulla formazione del Pentateuco, se il dibattito rimane aperto e le soluzioni proposte divergono, è interessante osservare che le ipotesi esaminate non concorrono ad alimentare ulteriori frammentazioni, ma — come rilevato in sede di comparazione — iniziano lentamente a convergere, anche tra chi si è definitivamente distanziato dal paradigma dell'ipotesi documentaria, su alcuni assunti ²¹.

Anche attraverso questi due volumi procede la messa a fuoco di rinnovati paradigmi circa la composizione del Pentateuco o l'esegesi di Esodo. Non ce ne si può che rallegrare, in attesa di ulteriori sviluppi.

Facoltà Teologica dell'Italia settentrionale
Sezione di Torino
Via XX Settembre 83
I-10122 Torino

Germano GALVAGNO

²⁰ Si pensi, tra gli altri, a B.S. CHILDS, *The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA 1974); a C. HOUTMAN, *Exodus. I-IV (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Kampen 1993-2002)*; e a T.B. DOZEMAN, *Commentary on Exodus* (Grand Rapids, MI 2009).

²¹ Ciò non significa affermare che il paradigma dell'ipotesi documentaria sia scomparso dal dibattito sulla formazione del Pentateuco. Non solo tale paradigma non è mai venuto meno, ma negli ultimi anni è presente una nuova generazione di studiosi che lo difende strenuamente, perlomeno sul piano della plausibilità letteraria (mentre non risulta un particolare interesse per la datazione delle fonti e per il loro retroterra storico): si tratta di B.J. Schwartz (il padre ispiratore), J.S. Baden, J. Stackert e Tz.L. Yoreh. Per una sintesi efficace della sensibilità di questi studiosi, rimandiamo a J.S. BADEN, *The Composition of the Pentateuch. Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (Anchor Bible Reference Library; New Haven, CT 2012), spec. 246-249.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Susanne GILLMAYR-BUCHER, *Erzählte Welten im Richterbuch*. Narratologische Aspekte eines polyfonen Diskurses (Biblical Interpretation Series 116). Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2013. vii-313 p. 16×24. £101-\$140

Judges research is alive and well as shown by this challenging monograph, by the wisely-selected bibliography at the end of this book, and by the continual additions to the lists of commentaries on Judges. See for example R. Ryan, *Judges* (Readings: a New Biblical Commentary; Sheffield 2007); S. Niditch, *Judges*. A Commentary (OTL; Louisville, KY – London 2008); W. Groß, *Richter* (HTKAT; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 2009), supported by his collection of essays in *Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände 54: Studien zum Richterbuch und seinen Völkernamen* (Stuttgart 2012) (the latter part by E. Gaß); T.C. Butler, *Judges* (WBC 8; Nashville, TN 2009); M.E. Biddle, *Reading Judges*. A Literary and Theological Commentary (Reading the Old Testament; Macon, GA 2012); M.J. Boda, “Judges”, *Numbers – Ruth* (eds. T. Longman III – D.E. Garland) (Revised Expositor’s Bible Commentary 2; Grand Rapids, MI 2012); B. Webb, *The Book of Judges* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 2012); and S. Frolov, *Judges* (FOTL 6B; Grand Rapids, MI 2013). Gillmayr-Bucher insists that the best choice of method recognizes a variety of perspectives and voices. This choice of approach builds on the structures built into Judges with its insertion of various worldviews. She does a commendable job in using real footnotes at the bottom of the pages to carry on dialogue with other scholars and to show her awareness of differing interpretations.

Gillmayr-Bucher’s goal is to describe the differing worlds projected in Judges by means of their literary discourse. She starts with several issues: 1) the varied depictions of the narrated historical moment, 2) the relationship of the tribes, 3) the literary connection of the narrative cycles, 4) the various perspectives issued by the voice of the narrator and those of the various figures in the narratives, 5) the moral and political order assumed and accepted as a given norm by various figures and groups, and 6) the search for an ideal hero to carry on the tradition of heroic leaders. The book offers no clear answers but opens up dialogues and discourses from various perspectives and voices. It lets the reader recognize various perspectives and interpret the text in various versions.

Gillmayr-Bucher works off of a philosophical literary theory called Possible Worlds Theory using a plethora of acronyms that then appear spasmodically through the text without a summary of their meaning or of their application in the Book of Judges. These acronyms include: PWT (Possible World Theory), NAW (Narratorial Actual World), AW (Actual World), TAW (Textual Actual World), PW (Possible World), IW (Intention World), KW (Knowledge World), WW (Wish-World), MW (Moral World), and OW (Obligation World).

Gillmayr-Bucher introduces different formats within a narrative. Important here are sections dominated by the voice of the narrator (3,7-11; 7,20-22), by alternating speech of individual characters (ch. 5), and by dramatic design.

Use of space and time represent another narrative tool described extensively and applied creatively to the texts of Judges. Space is represented in the land Israel seeks to conquer or appropriate for itself. Judges emphasizes room for action while leaving in the background detailed descriptions of the land. Still Judges offers no concept of a national center or land borders until Dan to Beersheba pops up in 20,1. Time and the chronological ordering of the narrative cycles create the concept of a Judges historical period. Individual time notes appear in the editorial framework and in the individual narratives showing the good times and bad times of the Judges period, a direct reversal of the good times under Joshua.

Gillmayr-Bucher turns to the major portion of her book: The Narrated Worlds stretching from page 37 to page 243. A review can show only the organization and highpoints of this central division with its eleven chapters.

The first chapter stands out structurally: 1,1 – 3,6, The Tribes and the Land dealing with Conquest of the Land, Reflection of the Situation, the Organization of the Judges, and The Narrative Framework giving structure to the book. Each of the following chapters begins with the unfolding of the Text World introducing the major story line, the characters, the perspectives from which the narrative is told, and the dominating voices in the chapter — the narrator, a character, a messenger from God, or God. Many of the chapters devote significant space to describing the author's use of time and space references to set the stage for the narrative and to show connections between narratives. Each chapter emphasizes a special theme of the book as identified through Gillmayr-Bucher's methodology: 3,7-11, Othniel and the Modification of Expectations; 3,12-30, Ehud and his opponent Eglon asking if an individual warrior can be a judge of Israel; 4,1 – 5,31, Deborah, Barak, and Jael as complex female characters and a simple warrior alongside Deborah and the world of the Judges; 6,1 – 8,32, Gideon questioning whether we have a chosen one of YHWH or a competitor who delivers Israel; 8,33 – 9,57, Abimelech examines rivals and the problem of claims to leadership; 10,6 – 12,7, Jephthah shows the nation seeking a deliverer but with doubts on Judges and Deliverers; 13,1 –

16,31, Samson sets one against all in a carnivalistic final accord; 17,1 – 18,31, Micah, the Levite, and the Danites delve into competing individual interests; 19,1-30, The Levite and his secondary wife are nameless actors with never before heard of relationships; 20,1 – 21,25, All Israel reports on Benjamin and the tribes experiencing a deliverance with great losses; [10,1-5; 12,8-15 are omitted from the Table of Contents].

The third and final major division looks at conceptions of Israel under the perspectives of Nation and Tribes, Leadership in the Book of Judges, Ruler and Nations, and the wrap-up section asking where do the narrated text worlds lead to? This reviewer can only summarize the conclusions of the final division.

In parallels to Joshua, Judges views the epoch as clearly negative. The land is a task yet to be performed because the land is distributed but remains in the hands of other nations. Judges begins with tribes not with Israel and concentrates not on topographical descriptions but on the land's inhabitants. In 2,11-19 the role of the Judges is reduced to that of a godly tool that accomplishes a temporary deliverance.

A narrative framework sets up the impression of a historical era with a continuous series of heroes. The author isolates seven elements in the frame: 1) evil in God's eyes, 2) deliverance of Israel to the enemies as reaction of God, 3) cry for help, 4) judge/deliverer installed, 5) divine support for the judges 6) deliverance of enemy to Israel, 7) rest for the land and the death of the judge.

Othniel shows that what appears as a tremendous momentary accomplishment affects an extended period of generations.

Deborah and the Israelites see their victory as defense of their claim to the land. The narrative joins spatial practice of land taken, spatial representation where action occurs, and spatial residence where people abide. In the song Barak's perspective is absent; so he exists only in Deborah's representation.

The Gideon narrative introduces conflict and lack of solidarity among the tribes. Abimelech then leaves no direct role for YHWH until the final statement (9,57) says that God repaid Abimelech and Shechem for their evil deeds.

A one-sided, distorted view of God caused Jephthah and his leadership to shatter. The turning of the nation does not lead to the hoped-for reaction from YHWH, but instead stirs up God's displeasure.

Self-centered Samson is the carnivalistic mirror image of an ideal judge. He crosses spatial, ethnic, and ethical boundaries. The idea of a deliverer as the tool of God is surrendered.

Micah sees the book's framework break down in a period without guidelines, laws, or common goals.

The repeated statements about the lack of a king show a clear difference between the author's time and the narrative's time. From ch. 19 on outside enemies play no role. A conflict between two small individual

groups develops into a civil war. The image of God remains ambivalent. The ending points back to ch. 1 with each tribe on its own land and living out the ethical order they know is right in their own eyes.

The summary section three gives quick answers to four important issues:

1. Israel as nation and as tribes. An ambivalent and heterogeneous picture appears. Twelve judges come from only eight tribes. Unity remains a goal and appears in the narrative framework as background for the narratives. Gideon's conflicts introduce a fragmentary perspective. The self-understanding as a unified people found in Joshua has now disappeared.

2. Israel's leadership. Judges shows leadership traits: cunning, courage, foresight, initiative, complete trust or confidence in God, and the capability to interpret contemporary conflicts in light of personal theological history. The leadership figures play no crucial role, give only a temporary solution, and bring no sustainable change. Jotham's ambivalent picture of kingship appeals to those who would enthrone a king to reflect critically on their expectations, wishes, and needs in view of a kingdom.

3. Foreign rulers and nations. Judges caricatures foreign kings displaying the same traits as Judges' expectations of an Israelite leader. The critical view on foreign kings is part of the basic critique of kingship in Judges. In the Samson story the presentation of the nations changes. No longer aggressors from outside, they become the dominant population within and the only threat to Israel.

4. The historical and canonical context of the Judges' Text World. Judges critiques the narrative of a time long past. Israel is strongly united, but Judges writes ambivalently with no solution to the problems of leadership and self-understanding. The book makes clear which ways do not lead to success, but nothing new stands in sight. Some leadership structure is required as are directions for living. No clear answer points to a time when this picture of Israel would find an audience. One is left to speculation or guess.

Judges suggests a time without leaders but with unified tribes. Its leadership design features a series of Regents who cannot establish a sustainable leadership model. The time of writing no longer holds up the heroes as role models and rejects Israel's traditional wish for a king. The central questions ask how did the tradition, the Torah, become central to Israel's life and how was it preserved. This points to small groups of educated scribes. This tradition leads Israelites to do what was right in the eyes of YHWH.

Gillmayr-Bucher finds commercial contact between Jehud and Samaria towards the end of the Persian period and so sets her guess as to the historical setting of Judges at this point. Such shifting of Israel's written materials to the Persian period with Israel's sparse collection of educated persons is becoming the contemporary scholarly fad. This reduces authors and audience to the same small group. Another guess at the answer might point to Israel's early monarchy when Israel sought true iden-

tity from its recent past and used the Judges materials in true literary competition among groups seeking leadership control.

100 Mimosa Drive
Gallatin, TN 37066
U.S.A.

Trent C. BUTLER

Bernd U. SCHIPPER, *Hermeneutik der Tora*. Studien zur Traditionsgeschichte von Prov 2 und zur Komposition von Prov 1–9 (BZAW 432). Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2012. xi-336 p. 16 × 23,5.

Die von Bernd U. Schipper vorgelegte Studie zu Prov 2 steht in einem größeren Zusammenhang: Sie ist aus dem von der DFG geförderten Forschungsprojekt “Diskursive Weisheit” hervorgegangen und dient der Vorbereitung eines neuen Proverbienkommentars, den Sch. für die amerikanische Kommentarreihe “Hermeneia” auszuarbeiten begonnen hat. Für Sch. ist die Studie “ein erster Versuch, das Proverbienbuch in Angriff zu nehmen” (vii). Sein Interesse gilt dabei in erster Linie den traditions- und literaturgeschichtlichen Fragen, und zwar aus einem besonderen Blickwinkel: Unter dem Begriff “textuelle Kohärenz”, den er von J. Assmann übernimmt (32), werden Bezüge zwischen Texten innerhalb und außerhalb des Proverbienbuchs untersucht, die von den jeweiligen Autoren “durch Zitate, Anspielungen und Schlüsselwörter” (282) hergestellt wurden. Ausgehend von Prov 2 zeigt sich dabei nach Sch. ein komplexes Bezugssystem zum Thema “Weisheit und Tora” (vgl. 283), das einen kontroversen theologischen Diskurs über das Verhältnis von Weisheit und Tora widerspiegelt. Indem deutlich wird, wie die Autoren der Texte jeweils aufeinander reagieren, lassen sich redaktionsgeschichtliche Schlussfolgerungen ziehen.

Im einleitenden Kapitel 1 erläutert Sch. den Ansatzpunkt, die Methodik und die besondere Fragestellung seiner Untersuchung: Er übernimmt einerseits die These, die im Kern auf H.L. Strack (*Die Sprüche Salomos* [KK AT 6; Nördlingen 1888] 313-316) zurückgeht, dass in Prov 2 “eine Art Inhaltsverzeichnis” (36; vgl. 198-201) zu Prov 1–8* vorliege. Andererseits knüpft er an eine Beobachtung von A. Robert an, der in seiner Studie “Les attaches littéraires bibliques de Prov I-IX” (*RB* 43 [1934] 42-48.172-204.374-384 und *RB* 44 [1935] 344-365.502-525) auf die zahlreichen und vielschichtigen Bezüge zu anderen biblischen Texten aufmerksam gemacht und damit ein Phänomen ins Blickfeld gerückt hat, das seitdem unter Begriffen wie “Musivstil”, “Midraschstil”, “innerbiblische Exegese”, “schriftgelehrte Prophetie” oder ganz allgemein unter “Intertextualität” diskutiert wird. Aus ägyptischen Weisheitstexten ist dasselbe Phänomen bekannt. Es handelt sich offenbar um ein epochenübergreifendes “Merkmal von Schriftkulturen”, dessen Voraussetzung “die

Literalität der Texte“ ist (34-35). Sch. bevorzugt im Anschluss an J. Assmann die Bezeichnung „textuelle Kohärenz“, da sie nicht auf eine bestimmte Literatur festgelegt ist und sowohl das literarische Verfahren als solches charakterisiert, als auch auf das erweiterte Bezugsfeld hinweist: „Es geht nicht um das Zitat oder die Anspielung als solche, sondern um den Kontext und den Bezug zwischen Sinneinheiten“ (34). Die literarischen Bezüge über den bloßen empirischen Befund der Bezugnahme hinaus zu systematisieren, ist Sch.s methodisches Ziel.

Die materiale Untersuchung setzt in Kapitel 2 mit einer synchronen Textanalyse von Prov 2 ein. Syntaktisch handelt es sich bekanntlich um einen einzigen Konditionalsatz, bestehend aus der Protasis (Vv. 1-4: ... **אם**, zwei Apodoseis (Vv. 5-8 und Vv. 9-11 jeweils: ... **אז תבין**), zwei Finalsätzen (Vv. 12-15 und Vv. 16-19 jeweils: ... **להצילך**) und dem abschließenden Hauptfinalsatz (Vv. 20-22: ... **למען**). Der klar gegliederte Aufbau, die inneren Bezüge und nicht zuletzt der „akrostichische Charakter“ (75) führen Sch. zu dem Schluss, in Prov 2 liege ein einheitlicher Text vor. Die auffällige Verdoppelung von Apodosis und Finalsatz, die mit einem Nebeneinander von weisheitlich geprägter Sprache (in Vv. 9-11 und Vv. 12-15) und religiös akzentuierter Sprache (in Vv. 5-8 und Vv. 16-19) einhergeht, beurteilt Sch. als „ein literarisches Verfahren, bei dem unterschiedliche Aspekte nebeneinandergestellt werden“ (52), das aber „als solches nicht literarkritisch ausgewertet werden kann“ (50). In diesem Punkt wird man geteilter Meinung sein, denn in der bisherigen Forschung wurde der Befund durchaus im Sinne einer „Yahwistic reinterpretation“ (W. McKane) auch literarkritisch ausgewertet. Und ganz ohne Frage werden mit der jeweiligen literarkritischen Prämisse auch die Weichen für das Verständnis der Redaktionsgeschichte gestellt. Bei der Interpretation des Endtextes wiederum konvergieren beide Betrachtungsweisen: In Prov 2 sind die weisheitlichen Zentralbegriffe mit Bedacht „theologisch eingefärbt“ (76), sodass die Weisheit als göttliche Willensbekundung erscheint (V. 6). Menschliche Initiative und göttliches Handeln wirken zusammen und ermöglichen das richtige Handeln auf dem Lebensweg, das mit dem Wohnen im Lande belohnt wird (vgl. 77).

In Kapitel 3 untersucht Sch. die Bezüge zu Texttraditionen außerhalb des Proverbienbuchs. Dabei kommen vor allem drei Traditionsbereiche in den Blick: die deuteronomisch-deuteronomistische Tradition (bes. Dtn 28,63 [Leitbegriff **מצות** und Landthematik] sowie Dtn 4,5-6 [Leitbegriffe **למד**, **שמר**, **מצות**, **יסר**, **ידע**], weisheitliche Psalmen (bes. Ps 37 [Korrelation von Weisheit und Tora in den Vv. 30-31, Landtheologie, Leitbegriffe **כרת**, **חסיד**] sowie Ps 19 [„Sapientialisierung der Tora“] und Ps 119 [vielfältige sprachliche Bezüge zum ganzen Proverbienbuch, insbesondere zu Prov 8 und Prov 2]) und spätprophetische Texte (bes. Jer 31,31-34 vor dem Hintergrund von Dtn 6,4-5; Jer 8,8-9 und Jer 17,1 [Vermittlung der Tora einerseits durch menschliche

Instanzen und andererseits unmittelbar durch JHWH selbst], Mal 2,10.14 [Verbindung des Motivs der "fremden Frau" mit der Mischehenproblematik], eschatologische Texte aus Jes 56–66 [Gegensatz Gerechte — Frevler; Landzusage an die Gerechten] und die Herrschaftsverheißung in Jes 11 [חכמה, בינה, דעת und יראה יהוה als Eigenschaften des eschatologischen Königs sind nach Prov 2 für den Weisheitsschüler in der Gegenwart realisierbar]). Die vielfältigen sprachlichen und thematischen Bezüge belegen, dass Prov 2 in diesem Referenzsystem zu interpretieren ist. Dabei zeigt sich nach Sch.s Auffassung "in allen Fällen eine Form der innerbiblischen Schriftauslegung, bei der besonders auf das Deuteronomium rekurriert wird". Gegenstand dieser theologischen Debatte ist das Verhältnis von Weisheit und Tora, und zwar unter der Fragestellung, inwiefern es dem Menschen möglich ist, "mit seinem Herzen, d.h. dem eigenen Verstand, die Weisungen JHWHs umzusetzen" (153).

Kapitel 4 befasst sich mit Bezügen innerhalb von Prov 1–9. Mit Recht unterscheidet Sch. methodisch zwischen (a) verwandten Themen, die eine spezifische Terminologie evozieren, ohne dass deshalb mit einer literarischen Abhängigkeit zu rechnen wäre, und (b) Bezügen, bei denen "weitergehende lexematische Gemeinsamkeiten vorliegen, die im Sinne einer textuellen Kohärenz interpretiert werden können" (156). Die Abgrenzung von (a) und (b) wird allerdings in vielen Fällen subjektiv bleiben. Im Sinne von (b) erkennt Sch. in Prov 2 ein Zitationsverfahren wie im ägyptischen Schulbetrieb, das andere Passagen aus Prov 1–9 in schriftlicher Form voraussetzt und diese Kontexte durch "Anzitieren" abrufte. Für besonders signifikant hält er die Bezüge zwischen 2,1–3 und den Anfangsversen der Kapitel 5, 7 und 8. In seinen Textsynopsen zeigen sich neben den Übereinstimmungen freilich auch die Differenzen: Keiner der drei Verse enthält ein vollständiges Zitat. Bezieht man noch die übrigen Lehreröffnungen aus Prov 1–7 mit ein, dann lässt sich der Gesamtbefund nach Ansicht des Rezensenten auch im Sinne von (a) interpretieren. Die Wiederholung von Begriffen und Formulierungen in den Lehreröffnungen ergäben sich in diesem Fall nicht aus dem "Anzitieren" einer literarischen Vorlage, sondern aus der gemeinsamen literarischen Form.

Anders liegen die Dinge in 2,16: Hier liegt ein wörtliches Zitat aus 7,5 vor und auch die Aussage in 2,18 stimmt inhaltlich mit 7,27 überein, was Sch. sicherlich zutreffend als Anspielung auf Kapitel 7 deutet. Aus seiner synchronen Perspektive folgt daraus, "dass der Verfasser von Prov 2 Kap. 7 kannte" (171); aus literarkritisch-diachroner Perspektive würde man jedoch diese Folgerung zunächst einmal auf 2,16–19 beschränken. Im einen wie im anderen Fall ist dabei eine von Sch. präzise herausgearbeitete Differenz gegenüber Kap 7 bedeutsam: Die ganze Passage über die fremde Frau in Prov 2,16–19 wird durch 2,17 theologisch eingefärbt, indem "das Verlassen des Gefährten der Jugend mit dem Vergessen des Bundes mit Gott gleichgesetzt wird" (173). Redaktionsgeschichtlich

macht es nun einen erheblichen Unterschied, ob man einerseits mit Sch. Prov 2 insgesamt als einen gegenüber Prov 7 neuen Beitrag im theologischen Diskurs betrachtet oder ob man andererseits wie u.a. der Rezensent Prov 2,16-19 als theologisch interpretierende Ergänzung zu Prov 2* mit einer theologischen Redaktion von Prov 1-9* verbindet.

Sch. stellt sich aufgrund der von ihm festgestellten Textbezüge die Redaktionsgeschichte von Prov 1-9 in drei Stufen vor: Den Grundbestand bildeten neun Lehrreden (1,8-19; 3,1-12; 3,21-35; 4,1-9; 4,10-19, 4,20-27; 5,1-23; 6,20-35 und 7,1-27 [so auf Seite 73; in den Wiederholungen der Liste auf den Seiten 214 und 261 fehlt 3,21-35]). Bei der ersten redaktionellen Bearbeitung wurde Prov 2 den neun Lehrreden als "Leseanweisung" (214) vorangestellt und stand in dieser Phase also vor 1,8-19; außerdem wurde Prov 8 hinzugenommen und durch die Einfügung von 3,13-20 inhaltlich mit dem Text der Lehrreden verbunden. Bei der zweiten redaktionellen Bearbeitung wurde einerseits der Anfang neu gestaltet — Prov 2 rückte nun von der ersten an die zweite Position der Lehrreden, das Weisheitsgedicht 1,20-33 kam neu hinzu, ebenso die Eröffnung 1,1-7 — und andererseits wurden das Zwischenstück 6,1-19 sowie Kap. 9 als Bindeglieder zu den Kap. 10-31 eingeführt. Sch. räumt zwar ein, dass die für Prov 1 und 2 angenommene Textumstellung Fragen aufwirft, betont aber, dass sich diese Hypothese aus seinen kompositorischen Analysen ergibt. Nach Ansicht des Rezensenten ließe sich ein plausibleres Bild der Redaktionsgeschichte entwerfen, wenn literarkritische Gesichtspunkte in die kompositorischen Analysen einbezogen würden.

Kapitel 5 ist der Frage gewidmet, welche Positionen die in Kapitel 3 und 4 untersuchten Texte in der theologischen Debatte über Weisheit und Tora vertreten. Den Ansatzpunkt zur Systematisierung sieht Sch. im deuteronomisch-deuteronomistischen Konzept einer Unterweisung der Tora (Dtn 6 und 8), auf das sich die Lehrreden in unterschiedlicher Weise beziehen: Prov 3,1-12 betont die Grenzen menschlicher Einsicht und hebt die Tora hervor. In Prov 6,20-35 erscheint die Tora gewissermaßen im weisheitlichem Gewand. Prov 7 dagegen hält am Konzept einer eigenständigen und als Vermittlerin der Tora leistungsfähigen Weisheit fest. Prov 2 vertritt ein Modell, das Prov 7 nahesteht, jedoch "von Dtn 4 herkommt und die Weisheit im Sinne einer 'Hermeneutik der Tora' bestimmt" (287). Um ein Gegengewicht zur Position einer sapientialisierten Tora im Sinne von Prov 6 herzustellen, bringt der Verfasser von Prov 2 außerdem Prov 8 ins Spiel. Ps 19 und Ps 119 nehmen sprachlich Bezug auf Prov 8, setzen inhaltlich aber die Linie von Prov 6 fort. Diese Debatte und damit auch die Redaktion des Proverbienbuches verortet Sch. unter den "Literati" (möglicherweise identisch mit den ספרים in Jer 8,8 und Esr 7,6.11), die in der späten Perserzeit "mithilfe des gleichen literarischen Verfahrens (schriftgelehrte Textauslegung) auf aktuelle theologische Fragen reagierten und dabei unterschiedliche Antworten fanden" (289). Die

Linien des Diskurses über das Verhältnis von Weisheit und Tora lassen sich weiter ausziehen über Sir 24 und Baruch bis ins rabbinische Judentum.

Kapitel 6 bietet eine kurze Zusammenfassung und ist inhaltlich identisch mit dem darauffolgenden *English Summary*. Literaturverzeichnis und Stellenregister beschließen den Band.

Auch wenn man zuweilen einzelne Textbezüge anders beurteilt, ergänzende literarkritische Überlegungen vermisst und daher nicht alle redaktionsgeschichtlichen Folgerungen teilt, so hat Sch. doch aufs Ganze gesehen die Leistungsfähigkeit des Paradigmas "textuelle Kohärenz" eindrucksvoll unter Beweis gestellt. Diese besondere Art der Traditionsgeschichte erweist sich als sehr erhellend und macht große religionsgeschichtliche Zusammenhänge sichtbar. Nach diesem "ersten Versuch" darf man dem am Ende des Wegs in Aussicht gestellten Proverbienkommentar Sch.s mit hohen Erwartungen entgegensetzen.

Lammstraße 5
D-72768 Reutlingen

Rolf SCHÄFER

Jennie BARBOUR, *The Story of Israel in the Book of Qohelet*. Ecclesiastes as Cultural Memory. (Oxford Theological Monographs). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012. xv-225 p. 16 × 24.

È opinione diffusa che il Qohelet non contenga riferimenti alla storia di Israele, caratteristica che lo accomunerebbe ai Proverbi e a Giobbe. Sol tanto con Siracide e Sapienza, i saggi di Israele si aprirebbero a una riflessione sulla storia (Sir 44–50; Sap 10–19). È noto il giudizio di von Rad sul fatto che il Qohelet sia un "ribelle isolato": "il Qohelet era incapace di entrare in conversazione con il mondo che lo circondava e gli si imponeva. Era diventato per lui un mondo estraneo, muto, che lo respingeva ..." (G. VON RAD, *La sapienza in Israele* [tr. it. Casale Monferrato 1975], 213-214).

Questo libro di Jennie Barbour, Visiting Assistant Professor of Religion allo Amherst College, costituisce la pubblicazione della tesi dottorale condotta a Oxford sotto la guida di Hugh Williamson. B. cerca di affrontare questo tema sotto una nuova prospettiva ispirandosi, più che al metodo della "intertestualità", ai lavori di R. Hays su Paolo (*Echoes of Scriptures in the Letters of Paul* [New Haven 1989]); si propone di scoprire nel Qohelet ("Ecclesiastes", nella dizione da lei preferita; cf. p. 9) "allusioni" o "evocazioni" relative alla storia di Israele a noi nota dai testi biblici (cf. 2-9).

Il primo capitolo (9-36) affronta il tema della finzione salomonica che governa l'intero Qohelet; secondo B. ciò avviene per colorare il testo "by national historical memory" (10); il re che il libro sottintende non è soltanto Salomone, quanto piuttosto "a pastiche of Israel's kings" (*ibid.*), "Everyking" (26), una cifra che riassume tutti i possibili re d'Israele. No-

tiamo di passaggio che le due pagine dedicate all'analisi del nome קהלת non tengono conto della dettagliata analisi di A. Schoors, *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words*, II (Leuven – Paris – Dudley, MA 2004) 432-339. Il Qohelet è per lui “the speaker in the assembly” (Schoors, *The Preacher*, 439), senza che sia possibile definire di quale assemblea si tratti; un maestro dunque, prima ancora che un re. Secondo B., la finzione regale utilizzata dal Qohelet, seguendo modelli tipici dell'Oriente (il “testamento regale”), serve per costruire una figura di re universale che avvicina i re d'Israele ai peggiori governanti pagani, offrendo una visione pessimistica e critica della regalità (30-36).

Il secondo capitolo (36-76) affronta l'analisi dei due poemi iniziali: Qo 1,4-11 e 3,1-15. Tesi di fondo è che “Qohelet's interests are comprehensively historical because they involve seeing everything that has been done (past human actions) and because that ‘everything’ is on the public stage” (40); B. riconosce che si tratta di una definizione ristretta di “storia” (40, n. 13), sulla quale si potrebbe discutere.

In Qo 1,4-11 l'accento non cadrebbe tanto sul rifiuto di una visione apocalittica della storia – pure riconosciuta presente — quanto sulla percezione negativa del passato, letto come una storia di declino. Notiamo ancora come l'analisi dei vocaboli del Qohelet poteva essere più approfondita; su עֲשָׂה, ad esempio (43), si poteva utilizzare di nuovo Schoors, *The Preacher Sought*, 75-85.

Quanto al poema dei tempi (3,1-15), B. cerca di scoprirvi allusioni a un recente passato (59-66); così, “tempo per piantare e tempo per sradicare il piantato, tempo per costruire e tempo per demolire” alluderebbe all'attività profetica di Geremia (cf. Ger 1,10; 24,6 etc.) e dunque a ciò che Israele ha sperimentato nella sua storia da parte di Dio. B. si ispira alla lettura offerta dal *Midrash Qohelet Rabbah* (58). Quanto al poema dei tempi, Qo 3,1-8, sarebbe un testo che non porta segni di determinismo; i “tempi” sarebbero semplicemente “the time when something happens” (75).

Nel terzo capitolo (“Remembrance of Kings Past”, 77-105) si introduce il concetto di “memoria collettiva”, sulla base degli studi del sociologo M. Halbwachs (81-82); la via attraverso la quale le società costruiscono e commemorano il proprio passato, specie se traumatico. Il difficile passo di Qo 4,13-16 viene letto come composto da frammenti del proprio passato; la storia del giovane povero, ma saggio, che diviene re al posto di un vecchio folle, intreccerebbe tratti della storia di Salomone e Geroboamo, di Saul, di David e dei suoi figli, in quella che con Ze'ev Weisman viene definita una “kaleidoscopic reconstruction” (91). Lo stesso principio vale per Qo 4,17 – 5,6, il brano sul culto, che riecheggerebbe criticamente il sogno di Salomone a Gabaon e la critica a Saul contenuta in 1 Sam 15,22.

Il quarto capitolo (106-137) si concentra sulla scoperta di echi dell'esilio in particolare in Qo 5,12-16 e 6,1-6: sono tali gli accenni alle te-

nebre, alla morte, al dolore, agli estranei che divorano le ricchezze di chi le ha accumulate (cf. Qo 6,2) ... Così la storia della piccola città assediata da un grande re (Qo 9,14-15), si può meglio comprendere sullo sfondo dell'assedio di Sennacherib a Gerusalemme. L'assenza di nomi propri andrebbe letta, come accadrà in Sap 10, alla luce del tentativo di rendere più universali i testi biblici (122-123); il saggio che salva la città alluderebbe al profeta Isaia.

Il capitolo conclusivo (138-167) si occupa del poema finale (11,1-6; 11,7 – 12,8) scoprendovi nuove allusioni all'esilio, sulla scia di antiche interpretazioni giudaiche, richiamando un vecchio studio di Ch. Taylor (*The Dirge of Coheleth in Ecclesiastes XII Discussed and Literally Interpreted* [London 1874]), della cui riscoperta B. si dichiara debitrice a M.V. Fox; ma cf. già L. Mazzinghi, *Ho cercato e ho esplorato*. Studi sul Qohelet (Bologna 2009) 292, n. 44. B. contesta che il Qohelet utilizzi qui immagini principalmente di carattere escatologico. Il Qohelet chiuderebbe il suo libro con un testo che evoca i lamenti per la città di Gerusalemme distrutta.

Nella conclusione, B. afferma che il Qohelet si mostra profondamente radicato nel giudaismo del suo tempo (168-182), affermazione non certo nuova e senz'altro condivisibile. L'epilogo, in particolare Qo 12,13-14, non sarebbe poi in contrasto con il libro stesso, che mai critica Dio o l'agire di Dio, ma piuttosto la monarchia d'Israele, da un punto di vista deuteronomico (172-173).

Nelle pagine finali (173-182) B. cerca di offrire una prospettiva di lettura cristiana, sulla scia di alcune letture patristiche (Girolamo e Gregorio di Nissa), sottolineando che non ci si può limitare a presentare il Qohelet come una preparazione negativa del NT: "the kingship of Qohelet has a continuity with the kingship of Christ ..." (182).

Il Qohelet può dunque essere descritto come privo di interesse per la storia? Il problema di fondo è capirsi su che cosa si intenda per "storia", come fa infatti l'A. (cf. sopra). Che il Qohelet si occupi di fatti umani e di eventi accaduti pubblicamente, nessuno lo vorrà negare. Il problema è piuttosto, a mio parere, chiarire quale idea egli abbia della storia — un punto che B. non sembra affrontare (v. oltre).

Certamente il Qohelet non può essere chiuso in quel "sapiential egoism" di cui lo accusa J.L. Crenshaw (106), ma va visto in stretto dialogo con altre voci bibliche e para-bibliche e inserito a pieno titolo nella storia del suo tempo. La tesi di B. non è nuova; il problema è comprendere in che modo il Qohelet possa essere inserito nel giudaismo del III secolo a.C. Il contesto storico del Qohelet è stato ampiamente studiato; J.L. Crenshaw, "Qohelet in Historical Context", *Bib* 87 (2007) 285-299; L.G. Perdue, *The Sword and the Stylus. An Introduction to Wisdom in the Age of Empires* (Grand Rapids, MI 2008) 198-255, studi entrambi citati da B. Si potevano studiare però anche altri testi, come 5,7-10, ove sembra chiara la critica del Qohelet alla società giudaica in epoca tolemaica. Il modo in

cui il Qohelet presenta Dio (Qo 7,13-14 paragonato con 8,2-5; 10,20), può esser visto come un'ulteriore allusione ironica e critica alla monarchia tolemaica, sul cui modello il Qohelet descrive il comportamento divino.

Il libro di B. segue un'altra strada e vuole dimostrare come il Qohelet alluda o evochi consapevolmente testi ed eventi della storia passata di Israele. Ma alcune precisazioni sono necessarie. Per quanto riguarda Qo 3,1-8, le allusioni alla storia di Israele proposte da B. sono possibili, ma non certo le uniche. Una spia di questa difficoltà è l'assenza dell'analisi della difficile espressione del v. 5, "tempo per gettare pietre e tempo per raccoglierte"; come possiamo legarla a episodi della storia di Israele? È vero che 3,1-8 non può essere considerato un testo di carattere determinista, ma a mio parere i "tempi" di cui parla il poema sono qualcosa di più di ciò che vuole B.: il tempo in cui qualcosa accade (75; v. sopra).

È proprio l'idea del "tempo" nel Qohelet che non viene affrontata a fondo in questo studio. Il Qohelet sa bene che esiste una certa visione d'insieme del tempo (עלם in 3,11, "il mistero del tempo"; tema che B. non approfondisce; cf. 69-70); ma sa anche che l'uomo non è in grado di cogliere il senso dei singoli momenti (ע in 3,1-8). B. non sembra conoscere tutta l'ampiezza di questa discussione; cita J.R. Wilch e M.V. Fox (73-75), ma ignora P. Sacchi ("Il problema del tempo in Qohelet", *ParSpV* 36 [1997] 73-83); M. Gilbert ("Il concetto di tempo ('ét) in Qohelet e Ben Sira", *Il libro del Qohelet*. Tradizione, redazione, teologia [eds. G. Bellia – A. Passaro] [Milano 2001] 69-89); cf. Schoors, *The Preacher Sought* II, 111-119; Mazzinghi, *Ho cercato e ho esplorato*, 208-214. Il problema della storia, per il Qohelet, è piuttosto epistemologico; l'uomo non è in grado di saper leggere la storia come storia salvifica.

Per quanto riguarda l'analisi di 4,17-5,6, echi della storia di Salomone e di Saul sono possibili, in parte già riconosciuti (100); ma il cuore di questo passo resta la critica ai luoghi comuni del culto, compresa la prospettiva deuteronomistica sui voti: cf. Schoors, "(Mis)use of Intertextuality in Qohelet Exegesis", *Congress Volume* (eds. A. Lemaire – M. Sæbø) (VTS 80; Leiden – Boston – Köln 2000) 45-59. Non sono poi assenti da 4,17-5,6 punte di carattere antiapocalittico. Non va troppo rapidamente scartata neppure la proposta di A. Rofé citata a p. 103 circa Qo 5,5 (ma B. non conosce il secondo studio di Rofé al riguardo: "La formula sapienziale 'non dire ...' e l'angelo di Qo 5,5", *Il libro del Qohelet* [eds. Bellia – Passaro] 217-226).

Nel commento a Qo 9,11-18 la figura di Isaia è chiamata in causa per lo più alla luce del tardivo *Martirio di Isaia* (132-137); l'interpretazione offerta da B. appare un po' forzata. Quanto al poema finale (11,7-12,8), esso è così ricco di suggestioni che è impossibile racchiuderlo in un'interpretazione univoca. A mio parere, il filo conduttore non è tanto l'evocazione della rovina di Gerusalemme — che qua e là può emergere dal testo — ma l'allusione alla morte di una persona, fatta di immagini prese

dal mondo delle case ricche del tempo, ma anche dalla natura (cappero, cavalletta, mandorlo ...), immagini che utilizzano, in senso ironico, temi apocalittici (le nubi, il sole che si oscura ...); il giorno del Signore atteso dai veggenti è, molto più semplicemente, la tua morte.

Che il libro del Qohelet non sia opera di un saggio che critica Dio, è una posizione a mio parere del tutto corretta (cf. L. Mazzinghi, "The Divine Violence in the Book of Qohelet", *Bib* 90 [2009] 545-558), ma che le allusioni alla storia di Israele siano per lo più da leggersi come critiche rivolte alla monarchia da un punto di vista deuteronomistico, mi pare discutibile. La *Torah* non ha per il Qohelet alcuna particolare importanza; la sua critica alla monarchia è piuttosto una presentazione ironica di quella che R. Vignolo ha chiamato "sindrome regale" ("Maschera e sindrome regale: interpretazione ironico-psicoanalitica di Qo 1,12-2,26", *Teologia* 26 [2001] 12-64), critica fondata sulla consapevolezza che ogni ricerca di successo e di ricchezza si rivela un soffio (*hebel*); la vicenda di "Salomone" ne è la miglior prova.

In conclusione, quello di B. resta un libro utile, che conduce a riflettere in modo intelligente su un aspetto non marginale del pensiero del Qohelet e che contribuisce a rafforzare la convinzione che il Qohelet ha un forte legame con la storia. Che poi tale legame si traduca nella ricerca di continue allusioni o evocazioni alla storia passata di Israele, questo resta un punto a mio parere non pienamente dimostrato.

Via della Chiesa, 123
I-50036 Bivigliano (FI)

Luca MAZZINGHI

Matthew EDWARDS, *Pneuma and Realized Eschatology in the Book of Wisdom* (FRLANT 242). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012, 272 p. 16 × 23,5. €99.99

Cette dissertation, présentée à l'Université d'Aberdeen et dirigée par le professeur Joachim Schaper, bouleverse assez sérieusement l'idée que la plupart des commentateurs se font de l'eschatologie développée dans ce livre deutérocanonique.

L'ouvrage se compose de quatre parties. La première (17-57) concerne les *Prolegomena*, où M.E. fournit, en guise d'introduction, quelques explications sur les termes utilisés dans le titre de sa dissertation, puis les données générales concernant le livre, date, lieu de composition et contexte alexandrin, genre littéraire, etc. Il aborde encore la question de l'unité du livre, en s'arrêtant particulièrement à Sg 10 (44-57). On comparera cette dernière analyse à celle d'A.T. Glicksman, *Wisdom of Solomon 10* (DCLS 9; Berlin 2011), dont j'ai rendu compte dans *Bib* 94 (2013) 304-308. À la différence de Glicksman, qui offrait une exégèse originale, M.E. se contente surtout

de reprendre les *flashbacks* relevés par J.M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom* (AnBib 41; Rome 1970). Ces *flashbacks* prouvent l'unité du livre. M.E. conclut: tout comme dans la *synkrisis* de Sg 11–19, le salut en Sg 10 est envisagé “within the cosmos, in terms of the reception of cosmic power and kingship, and executed through the cosmos [...]” (57). Telle est la thèse fondamentale de M.E. Toutefois, affirmer comme il le fait que Sg 10 “offers practical demonstrations in history of the saving work of the cosmic Sophia in the soul of individual sages (7:27)” (48) me paraît contenir une ambiguïté: la figure de la Sagesse est-elle uniquement “cosmic”? Qu'elle exerce une activité cosmique universelle, Sg 8,1 le dit, mais n'y a-t-il rien en elle qui la rattache au divin? Sg 9,4.10.17 ne le suppose-t-il pas? On touche ici une des questions clés que provoque la thèse de M.E.

La deuxième partie (59-80) traite donc du cosmos selon Sg, dans son rapport au *pneuma* et à l'eschatologie. M.E. commence par étudier les évocations en *synkrisis* de Sg 11–19 comme actions du *pneuma* dans le cosmos et leurs rapports avec les autres emplois du terme *pneuma* en Sg (61-71). M.E. a bien relevé l'impact de la doctrine stoïcienne du *pneuma* sur l'auteur de Sg. Impact limité pourtant, puisque “it is unacceptable for the Jewish creator God to be identified with the cosmos. Instead, Sophia operates in the role of the Stoic *pneuma*” (71). Sur cette dernière affirmation, M.E. ne me paraît pas avoir argumenté de façon convaincante; je ne vois pas qu'il se soit arrêté à l'exégèse de Sg 7,25-26 — pas même plus loin (91). Or, ces deux versets sont tout de même un effort puissant, bien que non exprimé en termes métaphysiques, pour montrer que la Sophia n'existe ni n'agit indépendamment de Celui dont elle est l'émanation, l'effluve, le reflet, le miroir, l'image: ces termes impliquent une certaine matérialité, ce en quoi ils ne sont pas métaphysiques, mais cela suffirait-il à dire que la Sophia est de toute façon d'ordre exclusivement cosmique? Je ne le crois pas. Ne faut-il pas penser plutôt que ces termes ont été choisis précisément pour situer l'origine de la Sophia proprement dans La sphère du divin et échapper ainsi à toute forme de panthéisme. Par ailleurs, sur un autre plan, je note que l'interprétation de Sg 13,2a proposée rapidement par M.E. rejoint celle que j'avais avancée jadis dans *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse* (Sg 13–15) (AnBib 53; Rome 1973) 14: “The combination of the Stoic active elements, fire and air, [...] is *pneuma*” (71), mais alors, dans ce stique, le rôle du *pneuma* n'est pas celui que l'auteur lui attribue quand il parle du *pneuma* à propos de Dieu ou de la Sophia. C'est ici que se situe toute la difficulté des thèses de M.E.: le terme *pneuma* a-t-il toujours le même sens? Poursuivant sa recherche, M.E. s'attache aux rapports entre création et matière (73-80) et c'est l'occasion de reprendre l'analyse de Sg 11,17b en lien avec l'expression de *creatio ex nihilo*, ce que M.E. fait excellemment (76-80).

La troisième partie traite du *pneuma*, tout d'abord dans une perspective anthropologique (83-92), puis dans la tradition biblique (93-127). Par

exemple, M.E. analyse Sg 11,24 – 12,2, surtout pour expliquer pourquoi il donne au mot *πᾶσιν* de 12,1 le sens neutre, ce que plusieurs bons commentateurs préfèrent: ici l'originalité de M.E. est son argumentation (89-90). Par contre, voir en Sg 2,2-4 des épicuriens plus que des stoïciens me paraît un peu court et franchement discutable (92, de même 142). À propos des traditions bibliques, longuement présentées, on s'étonne de ne pas voir mentionné Ez 36,27. À propos de Ben Sira, considérer la traduction grecque "closely following the Hebrew in a word-by-word approach and therefore not a likely candidate for the creative reinterpretation of an older text" (118), c'est ne pas prendre en compte les travaux d'A. Minissale, *La versione greca del Siracide. Confronto con il testo ebraico alla luce dell'attività midrascica e del metodo targumico* (AnBib 133; Rome 1995). Quant à dire que, pour Ben Sira, "the spirit is not identified with Sophia" (120), c'est oublier le rapport entre Si 1,9-10 et Joël 3,1. Enfin, concluant cette partie, M.E. écrit: "Wisdom's physical understanding of the *pneuma* and therefore of souls, leads to the conclusion that life after death should not be conceived as incorporeal existence, but as a continuing existence as part of the cosmos in which the individual persists in a concern for and connection to the sensible world" (127). Non seulement je ne dirais pas que *pneuma* est *toujours* compris en Sg au sens physique: Sg 9,17 en est la preuve, à moins de dire que l'Esprit saint de Dieu n'est rien d'autre que le *pneuma* cosmique des stoïciens; mais, en outre, on verra dans la partie suivante comment M.E. établit ce qu'il vient d'écrire; il me semble déjà qu'on pourrait inverser sa perspective: la survie de l'être humain ne doit certes pas être pensée comme une existence "incorporeal", mais comme impliquant une authentique corporéité, non pas au sens qu'il continuerait à faire partie du cosmos, mais au sens qu'il assumerait dans l'au-delà une certaine corporéité.

La quatrième partie traite de "l'eschatologie réalisée en Sg": l'expression vient de l'exégèse néotestamentaire (22). Cette partie, la plus développée (131-200), remet le problème dans son contexte grec (131-138) et biblique (158-174). Sur Sg, trois chapitres analysent successivement les concepts d'immortalité et d'incorruptibilité de l'âme (139-147), la question de la mort (147-158) et l'identité du juste et l'eschatologie réalisée en Sg 1-6 (175-200). Arrêtons-nous à quelques positions majeures de M.E. La première est qu'il a bien perçu qu'il y a un rapport thématique entre vie et mort en Sg 11-19 et vie et mort en Sg 1-6; il pense même être le premier à le souligner (153 et n. 119, puis 198), mais il se trompe: plusieurs chercheurs ont souligné ce rapport, comme je l'ai appelé dans "The Last Pages of the Wisdom of Solomon", *PIBA* 20 (1997) 48-61. C'est même l'argument majeur en faveur de l'unité du livre, ce que M.E. concède (157). Mais, alors que, pour ces chercheurs, il convient d'envisager la survie des justes comme une existence dans l'au-delà impliquant, sous une forme ou sous une autre, un élément cosmique, une

certaine corporéité, M.E., étudiant brièvement la question d'une résurrection selon l'auteur de Sg, le nie (173-174). Résumant Sg 5,1-14, M.E. considère que, les impies ayant perdu leur richesse et leur pouvoir, "the nature of their existence is left to the imagination" (188): ce dernier trait renvoie certes à Sg 5,14, mais Sg 4,18-19, qui précède immédiatement Sg 5, décrit pourtant leur anéantissement, envisagé très clairement pour le futur; cependant, en raison du caractère poétique des passages cités *supra*, "the eschatological language is no longer understood to refer to a future great event [...]" (193-194). M.E. en conclut que "the hope of the righteous, even after death, is conceived as a cosmic existence" (199) et "Wisdom does not look for a future age but rather expects the work of creation to continue, bringing the wicked to their knees and the judgement seat of the righteous" (200). Les deux derniers chapitres concernent l'un, la royauté hellénistique et Sg, et l'autre, providence et ἀνάγκη en Sg (201-240). Dans sa brève conclusion de cette dernière partie, M.E. répète sa thèse: "Even life after death is understood as an ongoing survival of the soul of the oppressed righteous within the cosmos and in direct juxtaposition with the fate of those who oppressed them" (240).

J'ai dit plus haut comment il me paraît que la relation entre le juste survivant et le cosmos doit être comprise en sens inverse: la survie du juste dans l'au-delà doit impliquer un élément cosmique et il convient donc de parler de résurrection en Sg.

J'ajoute que M.E. n'a pas pu avoir accès aux travaux rédigés en italien et en espagnol (18); il s'en excuse et c'est à son honneur de reconnaître cette limite, qui étonne de la part d'un vrai chercheur et le mène à des positions plus que discutables. Il aurait dû dire aussi qu'en français, il n'a consulté que C. Larcher, et encore plus d'une fois de façon erronée. Voici quelques cas: p. 54, n. 89: pour Larcher, en Sg 10,10, ἁγίων signifie "sanctuaire"; p. 69, n. 35: pour Larcher, *Études sur le Livre de la Sagesse* (EtB; Paris 1969) 362-363, le *pneuma* cosmique stoïcien n'intervient qu'en Sg 1,7 et 12,1; p. 69, n. 37: Larcher ne parle pas d'un "atomic sense"; p. 138, n. 46: pour Larcher, l'âme est "d'une matière extrêmement fine et subtile apparentée au feu et à l'air", pas seulement au feu; p. 182, n. 288: Larcher se réfère à R. Cornely, qu'il ne suit pas.

J'espère ne pas avoir tronqué la pensée de M.E. et lui avoir rendu justice. J'ai tenté de faire voir combien ses positions ne m'ont pas convaincu. En tout cas, son exposé est clair et agréablement écrit, probablement plus réflexif qu'exégétique. J'ai admiré sa connaissance des dossiers de langue anglaise. Au lecteur de juger personnellement la pertinence ou non de ses thèses.

Novum Testamentum

Philipp F. BARTHOLOMÄ, *The Johannine Discourses and the Teachings of Jesus in the Synoptics* (Texte und Arbeiten zum Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 57). Tübingen, Francke Verlag, 2012. xiii-491.

Il presente lavoro ha l'obiettivo di approfondire le relazioni esistenti tra i discorsi giovannei e l'insegnamento di Gesù nei Sinottici, per contribuire al dibattito sulla storicità del Quarto Vangelo (d'ora in poi QV). Un rapido esame della moderna ricerca esegetica, svolto nel I capitolo, consente di concludere che l'incoerenza tra i Sinottici e il QV nel presentare l'insegnamento di Gesù è un argomento frequentemente usato per corroborare posizioni scettiche a riguardo dell'autenticità storica del QV. Tuttavia l'incoerenza è spesso solo supposta tale e manca di una larga base di dati che possano dimostrarla. Con questo lavoro l'autore intende supplire a tale mancanza, fornendo un quadro più globale e dettagliato delle relazioni tra il QV e i Sinottici (con riferimento al materiale non narrativo), rispetto a quanto fino ad oggi è stato tentato.

Tale analisi, secondo l'autore, non potrà poi non avere anche riflessi su una valutazione complessiva del QV e della sua affidabilità storica, anche tenendo conto della rilevanza, non solo quantitativa, dei discorsi di Gesù nel QV e del loro stretto legame con la narrazione.

I discorsi di Gesù sono stati accusati di manifestare eccessivamente la personalità del loro autore, con un punto di vista esclusivamente introspettivo, e di conseguenza sono stati poco considerati per la ricerca sul Gesù storico. Tuttavia la domanda sulla loro storicità rimane aperta e conserva la dignità di essere posta (cf. capp. 4-8).

Un rapida esposizione dei padri della Chiesa mostra che la domanda sull'autenticità, soprattutto nel contesto delle controversie, era già stata posta. Risaltano particolarmente le opinioni di Origene, il primo ad affermare la presenza di materiale non storico nel QV, e di Agostino, che punta a risolvere le contraddizioni distinguendo tra contenuto e formulazione (cf. capp. 18-19).

Tale distinzione è di fondamentale importanza secondo l'autore, anche per chiarire quale tipo di affidabilità storica può essere richiesta ai discorsi del QV. Nel capitolo II del presente saggio, con riferimenti a Tucide e Polibio, l'autore chiarisce che per la storiografia antica l'autenticità storica dei discorsi non implica una fedeltà letterale, ma solo contenutistica e questa conclusione può essere allargata, con qualche cautela, anche alla storiografia ebraica dell'Antico Testamento. L'autore però affronta solo rapidamente la questione del genere letterario del QV, accodandosi alla posizione di Bauckham, secondo cui i riferimenti geografici e cronologici del QV e la sua affermazione di testimonianza oculare (19,35; 21,24) ri-

corderebbero ad un lettore dell'epoca i criteri di una buona pratica storiografica. Di fronte a tale affermazione dell'autore, le difficoltà sono notevoli: ad esempio, è fino a che punto i procedimenti di simbolizzazione, che il QV utilizza sia in riferimento alla cronologia e topografia sia al materiale discorsivo, possono essere ricondotti al genere letterario della biografia ellenistica e sono generalmente compatibili con la pretesa di affidabilità storica propria di tale genere letterario?

Lasciando sullo sfondo questa questione, rimane certamente vero che la distinzione tra formulazione e contenuto risulta appropriata, per verificare l'affidabilità storica dei discorsi riportati da un autore antico. L'autore mantiene tale distinzione anche alla luce della ricerca moderna, che tenta di suddividere in quattro punti di vista fondamentali:

a. Punto di vista scettico: né i contenuti né le formulazioni dei discorsi giovannei nel loro complesso sono autentici a nessun livello degno di nota (cf. Evanson – Vogel, Bretschneider, Strauss, Baur, Bultmann, Jesus Seminar, Casey, Theobald).

b. Punto di vista scettico-moderato: i contenuti di un certo quantitativo più o meno grande di detti sono ascrivibili al Gesù storico. Non si riconosce alcuna autenticità alla formulazione verbale (cf. Dodd, Higgins, Schnackenburg, Brown, Lindars, Dunn, Bauckham).

c. Punto di vista moderato-ottimistico: generalmente si afferma l'autenticità dei contenuti dei discorsi giovannei e ci si apre in una certa misura alla possibilità che alcune formulazioni siano parole autentiche di Gesù (cf. Schleiermacher, Bleek, Leon Morris, Robinson, Carson, Blomberg).

d. Punto di vista ottimistico: i discorsi sono sia dal punto di vista contenutistico che stilistico/verbale in larga misura affidabili per il Gesù storico (cf. Ensor).

L'autore attribuisce particolare rilevanza alla posizione di Dodd (cf. C.H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge 1963]), secondo cui la risposta alla domanda se il Gesù giovanneo è una figura storicamente credibile dipende in larga parte dai frutti di un'analisi comparativa con i Sinottici, che non si limiti ad esaminare singoli detti o aggregati limitati di versetti, ma prenda in esame un'ampia base di discorsi giovannei, tenendo conto delle somiglianze non solo a livello semantico, ma anche contenutistico (cf. 61-64). Su questa base l'autore formalizza la metodologia per classificare il grado di somiglianza dei detti giovannei con i paralleli sinottici, distinguendo i due parametri della formulazione verbale e del contenuto (cf. 83-91).

Il primo parametro indica il grado di concordanza semantica ed è distinto in tre livelli (0: nessuna concordanza; 1: qualche concordanza; 2: concordanza stretta). Il secondo parametro indica il grado di concordanza contenutistica, esso pure suddiviso in tre livelli (0; 1; 2). La congiunzione di questi due parametri permette di sviluppare uno spettro piuttosto ampio di possibilità. L'A. ne elenca sette (0/0; 0/1; 0/2; 1/0; 1/1; 1/2; 2/2) dal

momento che è una stretta concordanza semantica, rappresentata dalla prima cifra, non può che comportare un alto grado di concordanza contenutistica, rappresentata dalla seconda cifra (2/2). Sono pertanto escluse le combinazioni 2/0 e 2/1.

Se tale metodologia permette di ridurre l'arbitrarietà che soggiace all'individuazione di paralleli con il solo criterio contenutistico, non sembra tuttavia totalmente efficace nell'articolare e porre in relazione campo semantico e contenuto, accontentandosi invece di una semplice giustapposizione. Ciò comporta che un certo margine di arbitrarietà permane, nonostante la raffinatezza della classificazione. Si riprenderà questa osservazione con ulteriori rilievi critici.

L'autore si sofferma nel capitolo III sui due dialoghi individuali di Gesù con Nicodemo (3,1-21) e la Samaritana (4,1-30), nel capitolo IV sui discorsi rivolti da Gesù alla folla, ossia il discorso del pane di vita (6,22-59) e della luce del mondo (8,12-59), nel capitolo V sui discorsi rivolti da Gesù ai discepoli, in particolare la prima parte del discorso di addio (14,1-31) e le parole rivolte ai discepoli dopo la sua resurrezione (20,11-29).

Dal punto di vista semantico emergono solo raramente connessioni strette, mentre più frequenti sono le connessioni basate su una sola parola. Dal punto di vista del contenuto invece la percentuale di contatto è molto più alta. Ad esempio quasi la metà delle parole di Gesù nel dialogo di Nicodemo sono strettamente legate nei contenuti a parti dei discorsi riportati dai Sinottici. L'autore osserva che gli elementi tematici chiave del discorso hanno controparti sinottiche caratterizzate da un certo livello di somiglianza. Ad esempio la necessità di una rinascita spirituale (cfr. 3,3; Mt 18,3 par.), l'importanza di una fede personale in Cristo come preconditione per la vita eterna (3,14-15; Lc 19,10; Mt 19,28 par.), l'enfasi su Gesù salvatore per tutti coloro che credono (3,16-18; Lc 19,10; Mt 19,28 par.). L'autore classifica al livello di 1/2 il primo parallelo sopra citato, notando sia le sovrapposizioni semantiche, sia le somiglianze di contenuto. A tal proposito la metodologia utilizzata dall'autore non gli consente di approfondire in che misura la connessione semantica "Regno di Dio" (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ) mette in relazione le tematiche della rinascita spirituale (QV) e del ridiventare bambini (Sinottici), solo apparentemente simili, e inserite tra l'altro in contesti molto diversi, l'uno rappresentato da velati riferimenti sacramentali (QV), l'altro costituito da una catechesi di Gesù ai suoi discepoli sull'umiltà (Sinottici). Queste considerazioni, che possono essere formulate in modo simile per ogni parallelismo che l'autore propone, non intendono negare l'esistenza di un certo grado di verosimiglianza, ma solo mostrare l'importanza di un approfondimento che riduca una certa impressione di arbitrarietà nell'individuazione delle somiglianze di contenuto.

Nel discorso alla samaritana, che pure contiene scarse connessioni semantiche, solo 4 su 12 proposizioni non presentano alcuna analogia contenutistica con i Sinottici (4,7b.16.17b.18). I parallelismi evidenziano

connessioni contenutistiche nei seguenti temi: l'autoidentificazione di Gesù come il messia (cf. 4,26 con Mc 14,62); l'enfasi sulla vera identità del salvatore (cf. 4,10.13-14.26 con Mt 9, 6 par., 19,28-29 par.; Mc 14,62); il ruolo fondativo del giudaismo (cf. 4,22 con Mc 7,27; Mt 5,14); l'inaugurazione di una nuova era nella persona e nel ministero di Gesù (cfr. 4,23 con Mc 13,2 par.). Si conferma che lo stile proprio di Giovanni, che rende bassa la percentuale di correlazioni semantiche, non impedisce di ritrovare abbondanti analogie di contenuto. Questa osservazione risulta valida anche per le altre porzioni di testo prese in esame e sembra costituire il frutto più prezioso del presente lavoro.

Nel capitolo VI l'autore conclude sostenendo che nel lavoro svolto "è stato mostrato che negare la possibile autenticità dei discorsi giovannei sulla base di una supposta incoerenza con l'insegnamento di Gesù nei Sinottici è ingiustificato alla luce dell'evidenza" (cf. 339). L'autore non intende arrivare ad una dimostrazione nel dettaglio dell'autenticità storica, alla quale sono connesse molte altre questioni, che egli affronta sommariamente nell'ultimo capitolo: anzitutto la storicità dei detti dei Sinottici, individuati come paralleli, poi la questione dell'autore del QV e infine il grado di fedeltà storica della tradizione giovannea ai detti del Signore.

Infine l'autore trae le conclusioni del suo lavoro, sintetizzando le principali differenze stilistiche e teologiche tra la tradizione giovannea e i Sinottici (capitolo VII). L'apporto che il lavoro di comparazione ha fornito a questo livello si concentra nello sfumare l'originalità teologica giovannea, evidenziando una linea di sviluppo di maggiore continuità con i Sinottici.

La bontà del presente lavoro risiede nel tentativo di superare lo scoglio della peculiarità stilistica giovannea, per ritrovare analogie di contenuto con i Sinottici. Anche grazie all'abbondanza del materiale considerato, l'autore lascia intuire come, nonostante la diversità di stile, i discorsi di Gesù nel QV abbiano più punti in comune con i Sinottici di quanto comunemente si pensi. Ciò incoraggia ulteriori approfondimenti, anche in relazione alla storicità. Tuttavia la metodologia utilizzata, che tralascia completamente il contesto proprio dei paralleli sinottici, impedisce di approfondire ulteriormente somiglianze e differenze e non sfugge all'impressione di piegare spesso il senso dei singoli versetti dei Sinottici ad una armonizzazione un po' forzata con il QV. L'eventuale sovrapposizione semantica, che non viene sufficientemente approfondita in relazione al contenuto, non riduce l'arbitrarietà nell'individuazione dei paralleli. Ciò indebolisce la forza argomentativa della tesi e impedisce di fondare adeguatamente le conclusioni, relative alle tematiche teologiche comuni al QV e ai Sinottici.

Zbyněk GARSKÝ, *Das Wirken Jesu in Galiläa bei Johannes. Eine strukturelle Analyse der Intertextualität des vierten Evangeliums mit den Synoptikern* (WUNT 325). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2012. xix-370 p. 15,5 × 23. €79

Si tratta di una dissertazione accettata dalla Facoltà teologica di Zurigo. Il lavoro ha avuto una lunga gestazione: dal primo abbozzo alla difesa della tesi sono passati quindici anni (1996-2011). G. ha lavorato sotto la guida di diversi professori (Klauck, Wedderburn, Frey) e in diversi centri universitari (Würzburg, Monaco, Zurigo, ma anche Helsinki).

La parte più propriamente esegetica (c. 4) applica a quattro pericopi giovanee la metodologia che l'autore ha precedentemente esposto (cc. 1-3), leggendole dentro il modello ermeneutico che egli ha cercato di fondare. È la parte introduttiva che merita, pertanto, maggiore attenzione: la persuasività dell'esegesi ne dipende intrinsecamente. Il conclusivo c. 5 offre una puntualizzazione complessiva del percorso svolto.

Lo scopo del viaggio, a tratti piuttosto impegnativo, attraverso il quale G. conduce il suo lettore è quello di mostrare che Gv conosceva molto bene i Sinottici e scrisse il suo vangelo in un dialogo letterario con essi (1.1). Per superare il dilemma metodologico in cui resta avviluppata l'indagine esegetica sui rapporti tra Gv e i Sinottici (1.2), G. ritiene che si possa verificare in modo inconfutabile, attraverso i metodi dell'analisi intertestuale (1.2.1 e 1.2.2), quali siano le letture che accompagnano l'autore ideale del QV: dalla bioinformatica G. assume il metodo della *Dotplot* analisi a cui affianca lo studio delle concordanze intertestuali.

G. si batte per un riesame dei metodi esegetici; egli ritiene che ci sia un modello dell'antichità che corrisponde al tipo di intertestualità poetica adottata da Gv (1.3): la lettura allegorica. Proprio Gv è diventato la pietra d'inciampo per il metodo storico critico; il discorso religioso è, in effetti, un discorso poetico (Ricoeur): il Quarto Vangelo (QV) è un testo altamente poetico e, con ciò, un testo dal doppio livello di significato. L'autore precisa di non voler semplicemente tornare all'allegoresi; occorre però domandarsi se noi, leggendo i vangeli, non vediamo troppo ovviamente dietro ogni *Story* parimenti la *History*, soltanto perché la nostra tradizione è plasmata più da Agostino che da Origene. L'allegoria cristiana è un procedimento simbolico ancorato nella struttura poetica e/o nell'intertestualità (della Sacra Scrittura); essa conferisce al testo un secondo significato. Il metodo allegorico (col suo presupposto dell'unità della Scrittura ispirata) rende possibile considerare gli scritti dell'AT e del NT come un tutto e collegare i testi gli uni con gli altri: questo *continuum*, in cui l'allegoresi si muoveva, lo possiamo chiamare intertestualità. Non l'*intentio auctoris / operis / lectoris* deve essere ricercata, ma l'*intentio intertextualitatis*: i libri parlano direttamente gli uni con gli altri e l'autore / lettore reale (empirico) – in quanto istanza esterna al testo — non ha più alcun posto nel loro dialogo.

Il c. 2 del libro s'interessa alla teopoetica giovannea. Se la terminologia "teopoetica" è recente, la relazione fra poesia e teologia è, in realtà, antica. Purtroppo né la retorica o la poetica antica né l'esegesi moderna hanno mai sviluppato una teoria sistematica delle citazioni e fino a oggi la metodologia del procedimento intertestuale manca di istanze di controllo (2.2). La lettura intertestuale è definita da G. come una "lettura deviata" (*abgelenkte Lektüre*). L'esistenza di un nesso intertestuale si dà laddove è presente un segnale che induca il lettore ideale a un cambiamento nella direzione interpretativa (*Signalbedingung*) e qualora il riferimento a definiti pre-testi nella lettura del post-testo conduca a una sua interpretazione più profonda (*Funktionalitätsbedingung*).

Oltre a citazioni e allusioni si danno le più diverse forme di intertestualità, perché praticamente ogni elemento e ogni struttura di un'opera letteraria può essere riprodotto. L'analisi narrativa è lo strumento che permette di descrivere e rilevare nel modo più obiettivo possibile le strutture poetiche di un racconto, come è il QV (2.3). Oltre che all'analisi narrativa, G. si appoggia all'analisi linguistica strutturale (2.4) che è soprattutto in debito verso il linguista di Praga L. Hřebíček; più specificamente sull'analisi testuale denotativa — che G. precisa come analisi testuale denotativa gerarchica — e sull'analisi semantica latente. A conclusione del c. 2, correggendo Birkhoff con Jacobson, G. presenta il metodo matematico da lui messo a punto per rilevare il tasso di poeticità di un testo (2.5): la poeticità, infatti, è una proprietà della struttura che può essere definita.

Il terzo capitolo, con cui si completa il lungo percorso fondativo, è consacrato a "Gv come racconto". Il QV è visto da G. come una unità letteraria, incluso il c. 21, ed è datato tra il 100 e il 125 d.C. Al paratesto del QV appartiene esclusivamente il titolo "Evangelo secondo Giovanni". Gv va oltre la storiografia e la biografia classica. Se i vangeli sono antiche biografie (Burridge), essi però sono biografie "esplose" e rappresentano un genere "estraneo": essi hanno nel complesso altrettanto poco in comune con le biografie antiche nella loro funzione, quanto la basilica cristiana con il suo modello greco; ciò vale soprattutto per Gv. Cercando di identificare l'oggetto del racconto giovanneo, G. formula la seguente ipotesi di lavoro: Gv recepisce la *story* sinottica di Gesù con la sua predominante scenografia galilaica e integra gli elementi sinottici nel suo racconto, non con l'intenzione di completare o distorcere i vangeli sinottici, ma per rendere il suo libro capace di connessioni con i sinottici per il lettore ideale esperto. La *story* neotestamentaria di Gesù è un mito nel senso comune di una storia su un dio, ma non si lascia assegnare in modo chiaro a nessuno dei quattro *mythoi*: commedia, romanzo, tragedia e ironia.

Le quattro sezioni galilaiche del QV sono studiate nel c. 4. G. affronta dapprima il racconto dei due segni galilaici, che si trovano all'inizio del c. 2 e alla fine del c. 4 di Gv: "Le nozze a Cana (2,1-11)" e "Il profeta nella sua patria (4,43-54)". Procedo poi a studiare la sezione caratterizzata

dal segno del pane (Gv 6 e inizio del c. 7): “Il pane dal cielo (6,1 – 7,10)”, e l’epilogo (Gv 21,1-25). L’esegesi delle quattro pericopi procede secondo il medesimo schema: a una introduzione segue la segmentazione (*Sequenzierung*) del testo (giovanneo) e dei pre-testi (sinottici); il cuore dell’indagine è il momento chiamato Analisi dell’intertestualità a cui segue l’indagine sul significato allegorico.

Scopo del c. 4 è un’analisi complessiva degli intertesti giovanneo — sinottici. L’inter testo è l’insieme del post-testo giovanneo e dei tre pre-testi sinottici. Ci soffermiamo sull’analisi di Gv 2,1-12. Lo scopo che G. si prefigge è rispondere alla domanda se il racconto di Gv 2,1-12, in una lettura intertestuale, ha senso anche sullo sfondo sinottico. Appoggiandosi all’Analisi semantica latente, l’autore conclude che possiamo prendere in considerazione Mc 2,18-22, Mt 9,14-17 e Lc 5,33-39 come pre-testi di Gv 2,1-12. I tratti caratteristici del modo di lavorare inter-testuale di Gv sono quattro: il quarto — quello di maggior rilievo — è la rilettura allegorica dei pre-testi. Semplici *logia* (o parabole o motivi) sinottici vengono sviluppati in racconti complessi mediante una rilettura intertestuale, attraverso la quale vengono dotati di un secondo significato (allegorico), dove il livello metadiegetico del racconto, che presso i sinottici è ancora ben riconoscibile, è spesso largamente annullato. L’allegoria è ancorata nella struttura poetica del testo e dunque l’accesso al significato allegorico deve passare per l’analisi strutturale. In particolare, G. si serve dell’analisi testuale denotativa, che raggruppa in insiemi (*diskurssemantische Einheiten*) tutte le parole secondo il loro significato (denotazione). Con l’aiuto della statistica dei vocaboli si arriva poi a decidere sull’appartenenza di queste unità semantiche al nucleo del testo. Quando si legge il racconto come il racconto delle nozze di Cana, se n’è colto il significato allegorico. Ovviamente da nessuna parte nel testo si dice che Gesù sia lo sposo: il significato allegorico è un “significato estraneo”, così come l’inter testualità è la “parola estranea”. Per molti autori lo sfondo di Gv 2,1-11 si trova nella letteratura giudaica e pagana; a giudizio di G. sono soprattutto i sinottici, dei cui motivi il quarto evangelista si servì. Il mito della primavera e dell’inizio, collegato all’apparizione di una nuova compagnia, che si cristallizza attorno all’eroe, la cui apparizione viene spesso segnalata mediante una cerimonia festosa (un matrimonio): questo è in breve il significato allegorico della rilettura giovannea dei Sinottici. Si tratta, però, precisamente di un’allegoria sui Sinottici.

Nel conclusivo c. 5, G. vuole definire più puntualmente il procedimento intertestuale di Gv. Le analisi del c. 4 hanno mostrato che è possibile una lettura intertestuale del QV sullo sfondo dei tre Sinottici. L’inter testualità letteraria giovannea è un tipo speciale di intertestualità letteraria: una lettura con piena comprensione di Gv non esige, infatti, in termini assoluti la conoscenza previa dei Sinottici, ma il lettore ideale esperto può fare un passo in avanti e leggere il racconto sullo sfondo dei

sinottici. Per G. la modalità di lavoro intertestuale dell'autore del QV corrisponde perfettamente a quello che Eco chiama ironia intertestuale: "L'ironia intertestuale non invita tutti i lettori alla stessa festa. È come un banchetto in cui i resti delle pietanze consumate al piano superiore sono distribuiti al piano terra: non i resti nei piatti, ma quelli nei tegami". È questo il modo in cui Gv guida la lettura dei vangeli più antichi presso i suoi lettori. Il che ovviamente non significa che il lettore reale, nel bosco dell'intertestualità giovannea, debba seguire tutti i sentieri che G. ci fa percorrere insieme al lettore ideale esperto; neppure che tutti questi sentieri fossero conosciuti all'autore reale, che piantò questo bosco circa 2000 anni fa: il bosco dell'intertestualità cresce con la competenza intertestuale del lettore. Dal punto di vista storico, l'immagine che esce dall'analisi condotta si può spiegare soltanto nel senso che, con grande verosimiglianza, i tre vangeli sinottici stavano in forma scritta davanti all'autore reale del QV.

In sede di valutazione conclusiva, si deve anzitutto annotare come l'esegesi giovannea contemporanea presenti le posizioni più disparate. Un vero consenso non si dà probabilmente su nessun aspetto cruciale dell'interpretazione di Gv. In tale contesto, il lavoro di G. costituisce un contributo di grande stimolo al dibattito su molte questioni relative alla genesi e alla natura del QV, non solo per quanto riguarda il suo rapporto con i Sinottici.

L'apparato metodologico messo in campo da questa indagine è impressionante e l'impegno richiesto al lettore nella lettura di varie parti del lavoro è enorme. La parte "matematica" della metodologia adottata (*Dotplot* analisi e analisi testuale denotativa gerarchica) è di difficile digestione e, per essere maneggiata e giudicata nella sua pertinenza e validità, chiede competenze specifiche che sono fuori della portata di chi scrive questa recensione.

L'approccio linguistico e i sofisticati calcoli matematici sono al servizio di una istanza teologica di grande portata: il recupero della peculiarità del testo biblico. Lamentando la scomparsa di una teoria del testo che sappia interpretare adeguatamente la specificità della Scrittura, G. intende recuperare le istanze tradizionali dell'esegesi antica, soprattutto origeniana. Essa vedeva nella Scrittura un insieme unitario; l'intertestualità diventa per G. il nuovo nome del *continuum* che rende unitaria la Scrittura.

L'approccio di G. prescinde completamente da questioni relative al rapporto tra testo e storia: il QV rimanda a se stesso e non al di là di sé. Interessa non la realtà, ma la rappresentazione di essa contenuta nell'opera d'arte. Nei limiti almeno delle pericopi indagate non c'è alcuna considerazione della qualità testimoniale e storica del QV.

Anche se G. giustifica la scelta nell'introduzione, la sua posizione sul rapporto tra Gv e i Sinottici andrebbe in ogni caso verificata su tutto il materiale confrontabile e non soltanto su quello relativo alla Galilea.

Lidija NOVAKOVIC, *Raised from the Dead According to Scripture. The Role of Israel's Scripture in the Early Christian Interpretations of Jesus' Resurrection* (T & T Clark Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies Series 12). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2012. xxii-269 p. 16 × 24

Se la resurrezione di Gesù è il fondamento della predicazione cristiana, lo stesso non può essere detto circa la sua presenza all'interno delle Scritture di Israele. Non sembra, infatti, che ci siano molti riferimenti in AT rispetto all'evento basilare del NT. Bene ha fatto, quindi, Lidija Novakovic (Baylor University di Waco in Texas) ad indagare sul ruolo che le Scritture ebbero nelle prime interpretazioni cristiane della resurrezione. Del resto sono quattro i passaggi del NT che fanno cenno al legame tra Scritture e resurrezione: 1 Cor 15,4 (“... fu risuscitato il terzo giorno secondo le Scritture”); Lc 24,46 (“Così è scritto, che il Messia doveva soffrire e risuscitare da morte il terzo giorno”); At 17,2-3 (“... argomentava con loro sulla base delle Scritture, spiegando e provando che era necessario per il Messia soffrire e risuscitare da morte”) e Gv 20,9 (“... non capivano ancora le Scritture, che egli cioè doveva risuscitare da morte”). Nessuno di questi versetti offre però a proprio sostegno la citazione di riferimento. Diventa allora necessario reperire i brani su cui la riflessione teologica della prima chiesa ha lavorato. Ed è appunto questo il percorso che Novakovic propone ai suoi lettori.

Si parte da una riflessione metodologica circa i principi che regolano l'interpretazione biblica nella letteratura del Secondo Tempio e nei primi autori cristiani. Al riguardo l'autrice mostra padronanza della materia e degli *scholars* che vi si sono dedicati (Instone Brewer, Daube, Lieberman, Hays, Ellis, Longenecker, Goppelt, ecc.). Per le interpretazioni giudaiche si analizzano le traduzioni (LXX e *Targumim*), le “riscritture bibliche” (in particolare i Rotoli del Mar Morto) ed i commentari scritturistici (*Pesharim*, Filone e *Midrash* rabbinico). In tale contesto vengono poi esaminate le celebri *middot* di Hillel e dei suoi epigoni. Ci si muove però solo su autori anglofoni o al massimo tedeschi. Altri che in Francia (Lévinas, Ouaknin), Spagna (del Agua Pérez) ed in Italia vi si sono dedicati, mi sembra anche con buoni risultati, sono totalmente ignorati. Problema generale questo che non riguarda solo Novakovic, ma l'intero mondo anglofono, nel momento in cui non riserva più nessuna attenzione a quanto culturalmente si muove in una parte della vecchia Europa. Circa il NT vengono studiati i fenomeni di intertestualità, quali citazioni dirette, allusioni, eco (Hays), oltre a sommari, tipologie (Goppelt), scenetipo e presenza del *midrash* con le sue regole (Ellis). La domanda finale del primo capitolo sarà il filo rosso di tutto ciò che segue: se il NT rilegge l'AT, e molte volte in chiave apologetica (Lindars), la resurrezione di Gesù non sarebbe il miglior candidato per un simile programma? Ed

invece rimarremo stupiti dalla parsimonia sull'argomento. Ma non anticipiamo troppo.

Una volta stabilito il metodo, Novakovic passa alla rassegna di testi da cui si può evincere un qualche concetto di resurrezione tanto nella Bibbia ebraica quanto nella letteratura giudaica precedente o coeva alla prima cristianità. Circa i testi scritturistici, l'autrice fa subito notare come il loro numero sia nettamente inferiore a quelli della letteratura egizia o mesopotamica. Anzi, alcuni passaggi arrivano addirittura a negare la stessa idea di una vita dopo la morte (Gb 14,12-14; Sir 17,28; 41,4; Qo 9,5-10). Diverso è il caso di Ez 37,1-10 (le ossa inaridite che riprendono vigore), Os 6,1-3 (la resurrezione ed il motivo del terzo giorno), Is 24-27 (il Dio che elimina la morte per sempre in 25,8-9 e 26,19) e soprattutto Dan 12,1-3 (i morti risorgono, venendo poi retribuiti in positivo/negativo in base alla loro giustizia/ingiustizia). Passando alla letteratura giudaica vengono analizzati 1 Enoch o Enoch etiopico in quattro delle parti più significative per il nostro tema: Vigilanti (1-36), Parabole (37-71), Sogni (85-90) e Lettera (91-105). Si passa quindi a Giubilei, 2 Maccabei 7, Qumran, Testamento dei dodici Patriarchi, Salmi di Salomone, Giuseppe Flavio, LAB dello Pseudo-Filone, 4Esdra, 2Baruch, Oracoli Sibillini e Pseudo-Focilide. La rassegna è molto bella ed istruttiva. Se una osservazione si può fare riguarda soltanto l'eccessiva sicurezza nella datazione dei testi. Personalmente rimarrei su tali questioni abbastanza prudente. Tuttavia, dall'esame di questo vasto mondo, Novakovic giunge alla conclusione che la credenza nella resurrezione prese piede nel periodo del Secondo Tempio e nella letteratura protorabbinica, ma con oscillazioni importanti. È universale o spetta solo ai giusti? Ha carattere corporeo oppure no? Ha a che fare con l'apparizione del Messia o riguarda addirittura il Messia stesso? Con queste domande l'attenzione non può non spostarsi sul NT.

Ed infatti il capitolo terzo, il più denso e corposo, esamina il *corpus paulinum* a motivo della ricchezza di riflessione che l'apostolo delle genti dedica al tema. Si passa dal motivo del Terzo Giorno all'intronizzazione del Messia, dal *Cosmocrator* alla primizia dei risorti per finire alla tipologia Adamo-Cristo. Le analisi sono ampie ed impossibili da sintetizzare. Mi limiterò perciò a brevi accenni. Va anzitutto detto che nessun autore neotestamentario argomenta su base scritturistica più o meglio di Paolo. Lo stesso vale per il nostro tema. Si parte da 1 Cor 15,3b-4, testo in cui il "risuscitò il terzo giorno secondo le Scritture" si legherebbe ad Os 6,2: Dio non lascia il giusto nell'angoscia per più di tre giorni. Ciò significa che il terzo giorno coincide con quello della salvezza. La rilettura di Os 6,2 in termini di salvezza totale e quindi di resurrezione conosce una buona frequenza anche nella letteratura protorabbinica e targumica. Che la più antica confessione cristiana circa la resurrezione vi si ispiri sembra un dato pacifico. Novakovic insiste però sul fatto che Paolo vi farebbe ricorso piuttosto nel senso dell'avvaloramento dell'idea di una resurrezione

generale, senza che l'insistenza riguardi solo il Cristo. Ragionare in termini di et...et e non di aut...aut sarebbe stato al riguardo più opportuno. Altro testo analizzato è Rm 1,3-4. Qui l'apostolo accoglierebbe una antica confessione di fede, centrata sul Messia Davidico a cui la resurrezione conferisce lo *status* totalmente nuovo di Figlio di Dio. L'autrice sottolinea felicemente come si sia in presenza di una conflazione tra 2 Sam 7,12-14 e Sal 2,7 secondo il principio della *inner biblical exegesis*. Fil 2,9-11 serve invece a mostrare come l'innalzamento post-kenotico del Kyrios vada letto in chiave di interpretazione midrashica di Is 45,23. L'analisi delle lettere paoline termina con la ripresa di 1Cor 15, ma secondo due nuove direttrici: la resurrezione come primizia (vv. 20-28) e l'ultimo Adamo (vv. 44b-49). Nel primo caso la conflazione tra Sal 110,1 e Sal 8,7 mostra l'inevitabilità della distruzione ultima della morte da parte di Dio. Circa l'ultimo Adamo il retroterra è individuato in Gn 2,7 ed Ez 37,5-14. In entrambi i casi l'aver notato come le modifiche intervenute o le varianti di LXX siano decisive ai fini dell'interpretazione mostra ancora una volta la conoscenza che la Novakovic ha delle tecniche interpretative utilizzate da Paolo sovente e con grande abbondanza.

Con il capitolo quarto si passa ai Vangeli, della cui narrativa stupisce anzitutto il silenzio di citazioni, allusioni o eco riguardanti la resurrezione, il tutto limitandosi a qualche sporadico accenno (Ez 37,12; Is 26,19 e Dn 12,2 in Mt 27,52-53 e Gn 2-3 in Lc 24,30-31 e Gv 20,22; in Mc non si registra nulla). Con l'unica eccezione di due motivi: il segno di Giona (Mt 12,39; 16,4 e Lc 11,29) e la riedificazione del tempio nell'arco di tre giorni (Mc 14,56-58; 15,29-30; Mt 26,59-61; 27,39-40; Gv 2,18-22). Al di là dei retroterra individuati per il segno di Giona (Gn 2,1 con i tre giorni e le tre notti passate dal profeta nel ventre del pesce) e per il tempio ricostruito in tre giorni (Es 15,17; 2 Sam 7; Sal 69,10; Zc 6,12c), la conclusione è che nei vangeli i testi siano al servizio dell'identità messianica di Gesù più che della resurrezione in se stessa.

Il ricorso vero e proprio alle Scritture torna in auge nell'ultimo capitolo, dedicato ai due discorsi degli Atti che insistono maggiormente sulla dimostrazione biblica della resurrezione in se stessa: la predica di Pietro a Pentecoste (At 2,14-36) e il discorso di Paolo nella sinagoga di Antiochia di Pisidia (At 13,16-41). Nel primo caso Sal 15,8 LXX e Sal 109,1 LXX, versetti uniti tra loro da una espressione comune (ἐκ δεξιῶν μου), permettono a due affermazioni di Davide lontane tra loro di proclamare Gesù risorto quale Signore e Messia. Al riguardo Novakovic, pur riconoscendo come taluni autori vi individuino una *gezerah shawah*, preferisce parlare di "lexematic association" (205) e di "*via negativa argumentum*" (206) in cui si combinerebbero modalità di interpretazione midrashica e "pesher-type". In realtà At 2 è un midrash in cui è all'opera una *gezerah shawah lato sensu*, un tipo di analogia cioè in cui si lavora per modelli multipli: l'associazione lessematica fa scattare argomenti conducibili per

via positiva e negativa, trattandosi di similitudini e non di corrispondenze perfette, il che è tipico della logica midrashica di natura haggadica. Per At 13, l'autrice riconosce con pertinenza la presenza di una omelia sinagogale in cui si gioca principalmente su tre testi (Sal 2,7; Is 55,3 e Sal 15,10^{LXX}), volti ad evidenziare come nella resurrezione di Gesù si compie la promessa fatta a Davide. Personalmente avrei provato a leggere il discorso di Paolo non tanto come "combination of scriptural paraphrase, explicit quotation, allusion, and scriptural commentary ... implicit and explicit exegesis" (213), ma più semplicemente secondo i canoni della prima tipologia cristiana.

Il lavoro si chiude con alcune considerazioni sui risultati raggiunti in cui vengono tracciate in maniera sintetica le due traiettorie percorse dalla prima interpretazione cristiana circa la resurrezione di Gesù sulla base delle Scritture di Israele. La prima linea spiega il significato della resurrezione del Signore in riferimento alla resurrezione dei credenti in lui (obiettivo a cui tende principalmente Paolo con Adamo-Cristo). Il secondo versante insiste invece sulla dimostrazione dell'identità messianica di Gesù: poiché l'AT parla del Messia come depositario di un destino di vita senza fine, *ergo* il fatto storico della resurrezione del Nazareno lo mostra inequivocabilmente nella sua veste messianica (obiettivo delle interpretazioni esegetiche di Vangeli e Atti).

La valutazione globale del lavoro della Novakovic non può che essere positiva, e per diverse ragioni. Il tema analizzato è del massimo interesse. Rileggere la resurrezione alla luce delle Scritture di Israele, della produzione protorabbinnica e delle prime opere cristiane costituisce uno spaccato attraverso cui ripercorrere secoli di storia e di scritti partendo da un solo angolo visuale. Senza però che si scada in una superficiale teologia biblica, ma muovendosi sempre sulle pendici di una seria esegesi. La metodologia è seria e ben condotta. I risultati raggiunti sono sobri e si limitano a dire solo ciò che può essere veramente affermato, senza enfasi inopportune. Per tutte queste ragioni il lavoro può essere indicato come modello per chiunque voglia cimentarsi in percorsi di *inner biblical exegesis*, muovendo da un tema, da un personaggio o da un evento che attraversa in maniera significativa i due Testamenti.

Via Garibaldi, 205
I-85029 Venosa (PZ)

Pasquale BASTA

Varia

Bieke MAHIEU, *Between Rome and Jerusalem. Herod the Great and His Sons in Their Struggle for Recognition. A Chronological Investigation of the Period 40 BC – 39 AD with a Time Setting of New Testament Events* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 208). Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA, Peeters Publishers & Department of Oriental Studies, 2012. xxxviii-668 p. 17 × 23,5

This hefty tome, the fruit of a Leuven dissertation directed by Hans Hauben, provides a very thorough analysis of the chronological data concerning the reigns of Herod and his successors. Its ambitious aim is, in fact, no less than to arrive at revised time settings for this period. The work proceeds in painstaking detail, and the Table of Contents (ix-xxviii) is a first indication of this.

The succinct introduction boldly proposes a new or refined chronology for the time period under discussion as the main purpose of the work (2). To reach that goal, a thorough study of relevant ancient literary sources as well as epigraphic and numismatic material is proposed. A second part of the introduction discusses the various lunar and solar calendars and other forms of time keeping relevant to the period studied.

Part One of the work is devoted to Herod's reign, from his appointment as king in Rome in 40 BCE until shortly before his death. The first chapter deals with Herod's accession and his conquest of Jerusalem. The author attempts to make precise proposals concerning the date of Herod's being made king in Rome. While the chronological data provided by Josephus have generally been accepted to indicate an accession late in 40 BCE, the author tries to make an elaborate case for the plausibility of fixing that date precisely on November 18 of that year.

Her main arguments are: (a) the fact that Herod's appointment needs to have taken place between October and December 40 BCE (54), (b) the Tyrian calendar's New Year on November 18 (30), (c) the *possible* introduction of the Tyrian calendar by Herod (56-57) in 39 BCE (59-60), (d) the end of the *ludi plebei* in honor of Jupiter on November 17, making the following day the first opportunity to convoke the Roman Senate (57-58); (e) the dedication of the Herodian temple on the day of the king's accession, on 27 Heshvan = November 18, 18 BCE (152-154), (f) the dedication on November 18 of the Roman basilicas of Saints Peter (between 314 and 335 CE, and in 1626 CE) and Paul (306-337 CE) "may have been chosen in commemoration of Herod's Temple dedication on 18 November 18 BC" (154), (g) the dedication of the Nea basilica in Jerusalem on November 21, 543 CE, because of a known "deviation of three days between the factual (i.e. Julius Caesar's) and theoretical (i.e.

Augustus's) Julian calendars: factual 18 November corresponded to the theoretical 21 November" (155).

These arguments show the author's scholarly acumen and incredibly wide learning. Yet, argument (c), the most critical element in the whole edifice, is no more than an "acceptable hypothesis", as the author candidly admits (56), and the identification at point (e) seems problematic. Nevertheless, the proposed date is well within the commonly accepted range late in 40 BCE.

In the same chapter Mahieu details the steps that led to the capture of Jerusalem by Herod and Sosius, usually dated to 37 BCE. According to her proposal, the siege of Jerusalem began on Yom Kippur (10 Tishri) of 37 BCE and lasted until March 5 of the following year. Here her claim that Herod's troops observed the Sabbath rest (68) but started the siege on Yom Kippur (206) seems self-contradictory.

Chapter Two deals with events dated by the regnal years of Herod. In Chapter Three many events not dated by year indications are put into the chronological framework of Herod's eventful reign.

Part Two deals with the final days of Herod and with the chronology of his succession. Here matters are more problematic with the newly proposed date for Herod's death on March 9 in the year 1 CE (292-293, 424), as opposed to the commonly accepted date shortly before Passover 4 BCE. Mahieu at first considers the problems with the conventional dating. Indeed, in the most commonly accepted chronology the time period between the fall of 5 and Passover 4 BCE is packed with events

It is impossible to present the entire argumentation for Mahieu's revolutionary new dating, because it takes up the better part of over 120 tightly argued pages (235-358). Therefore I wish to highlight only some of the more problematic aspects of this redating. The length of Herod's reign is given as 34 years in *As. Mos.* 6,6, and Josephus specifically states that Herod ruled 34 years after the death of Antigonus Mattathias (*B.J.* 1.665; *Ant.* 17.191). In order to support her argument, Mahieu is forced to propose that *Assumptio Mosis* counted years from the killing of Aristobulus III, the last Hasmonean high priest (352, cf. 356), an ingenuous solution that lacks plausibility. Herod was clearly in control of the country, including the high priesthood, at least since the death of Antigonus. Mahieu is also forced to claim that Josephus was in error regarding the 34-year rule (354). She also needs to shorten the rule of Archelaus, who was deposed and exiled in 6 CE, as she agrees (396). Josephus states that he ruled for nine (*B.J.* 2.111-113) or ten (*Ant.* 17.342, 347; *Vita* 5) years, but Mahieu's new dating for Herod's death allows only six years for Archelaus, forcing her again to assert that Josephus was in error (354, 396-398). The sabbatical cycle adduced by Mahieu (397-398) seems irrelevant in this context. Furthermore, Gn. Sentius Saturninus was governor of Syria until 7/6 BCE (200-201). He is mentioned several times

during the intrigues of a certain Syllaeus (*B.J.* 1.577; *Ant.* 17.24, 57). The fact that Quintilius Varus succeeded him is mentioned by Josephus shortly thereafter, just before Herod's death (*Ant.* 17.89) in the context of the proceedings against Herod's son Antipater, commonly dated to 5 BCE, but postponed by Mahieu until the autumn of 1 BCE. To mention Varus' succession only six years after the fact would be highly unusual, *pace* Mahieu's protestation to the contrary (289, n.1). Also, there would be a gap of several years between events related in *Ant.* 17.57 and 89. Thus there are weighty arguments against such a radical redating of Herod's death.

As to Herodian time keeping, Mahieu argues that Herod introduced the Tyrian calendar on November 18, 39 BCE, the calendar of Gaza in 30 BCE (following an Egyptian model), the calendar of Caesarea on March 5, 2 BCE, and in the same year, on February 5, the newly discovered *pater patriae* era (255-265). To ascribe the introduction of four different types of time reckoning to the same ruler seems hazardous. Mahieu fails to explain the relation, if any, between the calendar of Caesarea and the postulated *pater patriae* era, allegedly begun only one month earlier.

The relatively short Part Three deals with New Testament events. Mahieu's revised dating for Herod's death influences the suggested time frames for the birth of John the Baptist (Nisan-September 1 BCE) and Jesus (Tishri 1 BCE – March 9, 1 CE) (462-463). The suggested Herodian date does not substantially influence the timing given for John's and Jesus's ministry and death, and Mahieu chooses carefully and judiciously between options proposed by other scholars. Mostly outside the time frame provided in the subtitle, Mahieu also offers a detailed chronology for the ministry of Paul. Here it is of interest that she has Paul visit Jerusalem regularly at three-year intervals.

The conclusion of every part begins with very detailed and useful chronological tables which show at a glance conventional and newly proposed dates of many events, together with the source(s) — usually one or more passages of Josephus or of the New Testament — on which the dating is based. A general conclusion sums up the findings. A 50-page bibliography and full indices round out the volume.

The work is almost flawlessly edited and is a monument to the author's erudition and painstaking care. Even if in many cases this reviewer is unable to agree with Mahieu's new proposals, the work may be consulted with great benefit and relative ease for all chronological questions in the period studied.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Rome

Joseph SIEVERS

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 2013-2014. II semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 348, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	48	268	15	331
Fac. Orientalistica	3	1	13	17
Universi	51	269	28	348
Nationes	76		Alumni	348
Dioceses	167		Alumni	182
Inst. Religiosorum	49		Alumni	108
Inst. Religiosarum	15		Alumnae	15
Ex statu laicali	43		Alumnae	24
			Alumni	19

Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

ATTARD Stefan, *The Structural Scheme Ordering Book II of the Psalter (Psalms 42–72). A Synchronic Analysis* (magna cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. BARBIERO Gianguerrino, S.D.B.

ALBERTIN Andrea, *Rom 14,1 – 15,13 nell'economia della lettera ai Romani*. Una esemplificazione di vita etica alla luce della giustificazione per la fede (magna cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. ALETTI Jean-Noël, S.J.

ESPOSITO Bryan Joseph, *Commensality. Jesus' Meals with Pharisees and their Liturgical Roots* (Lk 7:36-50; 11:37-54; 14:1-24) (magna cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. BÉCHARD Dean, S.J.

PAVAN Marco, «Ricordava che sono carne, un soffio che va e non ritorna» (Sal 78,39). Il tema della memoria e dell'oblio nel terzo libro del Salterio (Sal 73–89) (summa cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. BARBIERO Gianguerrino, S.D.B.

PELLEGRINO Carmelo, *Maria di Nazareth, profezia vivente del regno*. Un approccio narrativo a Lc 1,34 (magna cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. BÉCHARD Dean, S.J.

RONCHIATO Roberta, «*Ricorda il Signore tuo Dio*». Il tema della memoria nella parenesi di Dt 5–11. (summa cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. BOVATI Pietro, S.J.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

KOWALSKI Marcin, *Transforming Boasting of Self into Boasting in the Lord*. The Development of the Pauline «Periautologia» in 2 Cor 10–13 (Studies in Judaism; University Press of America, Lanham, MD 2013, pp. 10+331).

ROSSI Lorenzo, *Pietro e Paolo testimoni del Crocifisso-Risorto*. La «synkrisis» in At 12,1-24 e 27,1-28,16: continuità e discontinuità di un parallelismo (Analecta Biblica 205; Gregorian & Biblical Press, Roma 2014, pp. 512).

Laureae in Re Orientali digni declarati sunt:

BAK Tomasz, *Il Proto-Isaia in Copto-Saidico*. Edizione critica sulla base di sa 52 (M 568) e di altri testimoni (summa cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. LUISIER Philippe, S.J.

YOHANNA Samer Soreshow, *The Gospel of Mark in the Syriac Harklean Version*. A Critical Edition Based upon the Earliest Witnesses (summa cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. MORRISON Craig, O.Carm.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

En este Elenco aparecen todos los libros enviados a Biblica, de alguna manera relacionados con los estudios bíblicos. La mención de un título en este Elenco no implica por tanto un juicio acerca de la obra. El consejo de dirección determina qué libros serán recensionados en Biblica.

Los libros y fascículos que non han sido expresamente pedidos por Biblica no serán devueltos al remitente, aun cuando no parezca conveniente publicar una recensión sobre ellos.

Todos los libros y fascículos enviados a Biblica se transmiten al Editor del *Elenchus of Biblica*, y aparecen en él a juicio de dicho Editor.

Envíense los libros a: Dirección Biblica, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, via della Pilotta, 25 I-00187 Roma, Italia.

Aitken, James K. – **Clines**, Jeremy M. S. – **Maier**, Christl M. (eds.), *Interested Readers. Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David J. A. Clines*. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xix-485 p. 15,5 × 23

Avioz, Michael – **Assis**, Elie – **Shemesh**, Yael (eds.), *Zer Rimonim. Studies in Biblical Literature and Jewish Exegesis Presented to Professor Rimon Kasher (International Voices in Biblical Studies 5)*. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xv-29-640-xviii p. 17 × 24,5

Baer, David A. – **Gordon**, Robert P. (eds.), *Leshon Limmudin. Essays on the Language and Literature of the Hebrew Bible in Honour of A. A. Macintosh (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 593)*. London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2013. xxvi-324 p. 16 × 24

Barton, John (ed.), *Bible and Interpretation. The Collected Essays of James Barr. Volume I: Interpretation and Theology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. xxxiv-568 p. 16 × 24

Barton, John (ed.), *Bible and Interpretation. The Collected Essays of James Barr. Volume II: Biblical Studies*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. xii-619 p. 16 × 24

Barton, John (ed.), *Bible and Interpretation. The Collected Essays of James Barr. Volume III: Linguistics and Translation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014. xi-798 p. 16 × 24

Bauckham, Richard – **Davila**, Janes R. – **Panayotov**, Alexander (eds.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. More Noncanonical Scriptures, Volume 1*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013. xl-808 p. 16,5 × 24. \$90.00 – £59.99

Bautch, Richard J. – **Racine**, Jean-François (eds.), *Beauty and the Bible. Toward a Hermeneutics of Biblical Aesthetics (Semeia Studies 73)*. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. x-124 p. 15,5 × 23

Bautch, Richard J. – **Todd Hibberd**, J. (eds.), *The Book of Isaiah. Enduring Questions Answered Anew. Essays Honoring Joseph Blenkinsopp and His Contribution to the Study of Isaiah*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014. viii-234 p. 15 × 23. \$35 – £23.99

Berlejung, Angelika – **Streck**, Michael P. (eds.), *Arameans, Chaldeans, and Arabs in Babylonia and Palestine in the First Millennium B. C.* (Leipziger Altorientalische Studien 3). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013. vii-336 p. 17 × 24

Boer, Ronald, *Postcolonialism and the Hebrew Bible. The Next Step* (Semeia Studies 70). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. viii-288 p. 15,5 × 23

Bokedal, Tomas, *The Formation and Significance of the Christian Biblical Canon. A Study in Text, Ritual and Interpretation*. London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2014. xvi-421 p. 16 × 24

Bons, Eberhard – **Passaro**, Angelo, *Dai salmi al salterio*. Orientamenti per le letture nuove (Scripturae 4). Trapani, Il Pozzo di Giacobbe, 2014. 250 p. 15,5 × 21,5. €20

Brooke, George J., *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Essays in Method (Early Judaism and Its Literature 39). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xxi-286 p. 15,5 × 23

Brown, Paul J., *Bodily Resurrection and Ethics in 1 Cor 15*. Connecting Faith and Morality in the Context of Greco-Roman Mythology (WUNT 360). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2014. v-312 p. 15 × 23,5. €79

Brown, William P., *Qohelet* (Strumenti, Commentari 58). Torino, Claudiana, 2012. 191 p. 17 × 24. €19

Bryan, Christopher, *Listening to the Bible*. The Art of Faithful Biblical Interpretation. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. xi-174 p. 14,5 × 21,5

Burke, David G. – **Kutsko**, John F. – **Towner**, Philip H. (eds.), *The King James Version at 400*. Assessing its Genius as Biblical Translation and its Literary Influence (Biblical Scholarship in North America 26). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xxv-553 p. 15,5 × 23

Calduch-Benages, Nuria, *Pratiche della cura*. Medicina e religione nel mondo antico (Lapislazzuli). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 2014. 78 p. 11 × 18. €8

Cesarale, Enrichetta, «*Figli della luce e figli del giorno*» (1 Ts 5,5). Indagine biblico-teologica del «giorno» in Paolo (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 206). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2014. 616 p. 17 × 24. €37

Chen, Y. S., *The Primeval Flood Catastrophe* (Oxford Oriental Monographs). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. xxiii-314 p. 16 × 24

Chrysostom, John, *Homilies on Paul's Letter to the Philippians*. Introduced, translated and annotated by Pauline Allen (Writings from the

Greco-Roman World 16). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xxxiv-345 p. 15,5 × 23

Claasens, L. Juliana – **Spronk**, Klaas (eds.), *Fragile Dignity*. Inter-contextual Conversations on Scriptures, Family and Violence (Semeia Studies 72). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. vi-338 p. 15,5 × 23

Dangl, Oskar, *Das Buch Habakuk* (Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar Altes Testament 25/1). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2014. 151 p. 13 × 20. €19,95

Davies, Philip R., *Rethinking Biblical Scholarship*. Changing Perspectives 4 (Copenhagen International Seminar). Durham, Acumen, 2014. xv-253 p. 16,5 × 24

Davis, Andrew R., *Tel Dan in its Northern Cultic Context* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 20). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xv-209 p. 15 × 23

Day, John, *From Creation to Babel*. Studies in Genesis 1–11 (Library of Old Testament Studies 592). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2013. xiv-230 p. 16 × 24

de Vries, Johannes – **Karrer**, Martin (eds.), *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity*. Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im Frühen Christentum (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 60). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xi-434 p. 15,5 × 23

Descreux, Jacques, *L'ivresse des nations*. Les figures du mal dans l'Apocalypse de Jean (Biblical Tools and Studies 17). Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA, Peeters, 2013. xvi-704 p. 17 × 24

Dionne, Christian – **Mathieu**, Yvan (sous la direction de), *Raconter Dieu: entre récit, histoire, et théologie* (Le livre et le rouleau 44). Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius, 2014. 203 p. 14,5 × 20,5.

Edelman, Diana V. (ed.), *Deuteronomy–Kings as Emerging Authoritative Books*. A Conversation (Ancient Near East Monographs 6). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. xi-289 p. 15 × 23

Edenburg, Cynthia – **Pakkala**, Juha (eds.), *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists?* Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History (Ancient Israel and its Literature 16). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. x-371 p. 15 × 23

Ehrman, Bart D., *The Bible*. A Historical and Literary Introduction. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. xvii-410 p. 20 × 25,5

Ellis, Teresa Ann, *Gender in the Book of Ben Sira*. Divine Wisdom, Erotic Poetry, and the Garden of Eden (BZAW 453). Berlin – New York, De Gruyter, 2013. xiii-290 p. 16 × 23,5

Fabre, Jean-Philippe, *Le disciple selon Jésus* (Le livre et le rouleau 45). Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius, 2014. 371 p. 15,5 × 23. €29,50

Fiensy, David A. – **Hawkins**, Ralph K. (eds.), *The Galilean Economy in the Time of Jesus* (Early Christianity and its Literature 11). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. x-282 p. 15 × 23

Finkelstein, Israel, *The Forgotten Kingdom*. The Archaeology and History of Northern Israel (Ancient Near East Monographs 5). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xii-197 p. 15,5 × 23

Flesher, Leann Snow – **Dempsey**, Carol J. – **Boda**, Mark J. (eds.), *Why?... How Long?* Studies on Voice(s) of Lamentation Rooted in Biblical Hebrew Poetry (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 552). New York – London, Bloomsbury, 2014. xvi-206 p. 16,5 × 24. £60.00

Flynn, Shawn W., *YHWH is King*. The Development of Divine Kingship in Ancient Israel (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 159). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2013. xiii-207 p. 16 × 24. €103 – \$133.00

Gallusz, Laszlo, *The Throne Motif in the Book of Revelation* (Library of New Testament Studies 487). London – New York, Bloomsbury, 2014. xxii-396 p. 16 × 24

Garbini, Giovanni, *Il Poema di Baal di Ilumilku* (Studi biblici 176). Brescia, Paideia, 2014. 183 p. 13,5 × 21. €22.00

García Ureña, Lourdes, *El Apocalypsis*. Pautas literarias de lectura (Textos y estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense 79). Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2013. 237 p. 17 × 24

Genre, Ermanno, *Osea*. L'adultera perdonata (Piccola collana moderna 150). Torino, Claudiana, 2014. 144 p. 12 × 20. €12,50

Gignac, Alain, *L'épître aux Romains* (Commentaire biblique: Nouveau Testament 6). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2014. 645 p. 15 × 23. €54

Gillingham, Susan, *A Journey of Two Psalms*. The Reception of Psalms 1 and 2 in Jewish and Christian Tradition. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. xx-344 p. 16 × 24

Granados, Carlos, *El camino del hombre por la mujer*. El matrimonio en el Antiguo Testamento (Estudios bíblicos 49). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2014. 188 p. 16 × 24

Grant, Deena E., *Divine Anger in the Hebrew Bible* (CBQMS 52). Washington, The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014. ix-200 p. 15 × 23

Hakola, Raimo – **Nikki**, Nina – **Tervahauta**, Ulla (eds.), *Others and the Construction of Early Christian Identities* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 106). Helsinki, Finnish Exegetical Society, 2013. 344 p. 15 × 21

Harding, Mark – **Nobbs**, Alanna (eds.), *All Things to all Cultures*. Paul among Jews, Greeks, and Romans. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013. xx-406 p. 16 × 23,5

Havea, Jione – **Neville**, David J. – **Wainwright**, Elaine M. (eds.), *Bible, Borders, Belonging(s)*. Engaging Readings from Oceania (Semeia Studies 75). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. x-289 p. 15 × 23

Hibbard, J. Todd – Kim, Hyun Chul Paul (eds.), *Formation and Intertextuality in Isaiah 24–27* (Ancient Israel and its Literature 17). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xiii-264 p. 15 × 23

Holm, Tawny, *Of Courtiers and Kings*. The Biblical Daniel Narratives and Ancient Story-Collections (Explorations in Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations 1). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2013. xv-576 p. 16 × 23,5. \$64.50

Holtz, Shalom E., *Neo-Babylonian Trial Records* (Writings from the Ancient World 35). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. xvi-272 p. 15 × 23

Hundley, Michael B., *Gods in Dwellings*. Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East (Writings from the Ancient World Supplements 3). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xxvi-425 p. 15,5 × 23

Huttner, Ulrich, *Early Christianity in the Lycus Valley* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 85). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2013. xxi-492 p. 16 × 24. €172 – \$223.00

Jacobs, Mignon R. – Person, Raymond E., Jr. (eds.), *Israelite Prophecy and the Deuteronomistic History*. Portrait, Reality, and the Formation of a History (Ancient Israel and its Literature 14). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. x-243 p. 15 × 23

Jacobs, Sandra, *The Body as Property*. Physical Disfigurement in Biblical Law (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 582). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2014. xvi-260 p. 16 × 24

Jipp, Joshua W., *Divine Visitations and Hospitality to Strangers in Luke-Acts*. An Interpretation of the Malta Episode in Acts 28:1–10 (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 153). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2013. xiv-335 p. 16 × 24. €125 – \$162,00

Johnson Hodge, Carolina – Olyan, Saul M. – Ullucci, Daniel – Wasserman, Emma (eds.), *“The One Who Sows Bountifully”*. Essays in Honor of Stanley K. Stowers (Brown Judaic Studies 356). Providence, Rhode Island, Brown University, 2013. xx-362 p. 16 × 24. \$64.95

Kaminski, Carol M., *Was Noah Good? Finding Favour in the Flood Narrative* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 563). London – New York, Bloomsbury, 2014. xiv-223 p. 16 × 24

Keith, Chris, *The Pericope Adulteræ, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus* (New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 38). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2014. xvi-320 p. 23,5 × 15,5. €37,5 – \$49,00

Kelber, Werner H. *Imprints, Voiceprints, and Footprints of Memory*. Collected Essays of Werner H. Kelber (Resources for Biblical Study 74). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xxii-507 p. 15,5 × 23

Kiilunen, Jarmo – Nikki, Nina, *Alfasta oomegaan*. Uuden testamentin kreikan tukipaketti (Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran Julkaisu 103). Helsinki, Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran, 2012. 382 p. 17,5 × 25

BIBLICA
REVISTA TRIMESTRAL
PUBBLICADA POR EL PONTIFICIO INSTITUTO BIBLICO DE ROMA

CONSEJO DE DIRECCION

DEAN P. BÉCHARD (director) – JEAN LOUIS SKA (responsable de la sección Antiguo Testamento) – ANDRZEJ GIENIUSZ (responsable de la sección Nuevo Testamento) – NURIA CALDUCH-BENAGES (responsable de la sección Recensiones) – ROMAN J. LEBIEDZIUK (secretario de redacción) – LEO ARNOLD (asistente de la redacción)

CONSEJO DE REDACCION

JOSÉ MARÍA ÁBREGO DE LACY – JEAN-NOËL ALETTI – ROBERT ALTHANN – GIANNI BARBIERO – JOHANNES BEUTLER – PIETRO BOVATI – ANTHONY J. FORTE – PETER DUBOVSKÝ – MAURICE GILBERT – JUAN MANUEL GRANADOS ROJAS – JOHN KILGALLAN – REINHARD NEUDECKER – STEPHEN PISANO – JOSEPH SIEVERS – KLEMENS STOCK – JAMES SWETNAM – ALBERT VANHOYE

Biblica se publica cuatro veces al año, en fascículos de aproximadamente 160 páginas. La lista de las abreviaciones más usadas en *Biblica*, así como las indicaciones para la confección de los manuscritos enviados a la revista, se encuentran en "Editorial Instructions for Contributors" en nuestra edición *on-line*: www.bsw.org/project/biblica.

Nuestra manera de proceder con los libros enviados para recensión se indica al comienzo de la sección "Libri ad Directionem missi", p. 152.

Biblica no se hace responsable de las opiniones sostenidas por los colaboradores.

Dirección de la redacción:

Biblica – Pontificio Istituto Biblico – Via della Pilotta, 25 – I-00187 Roma

E-mail: biblica@bsw.org

ADMINISTRACION

Suscripción anual: €70,00

Precio de los volúmenes anteriores: Vol. 81 (2000) a Vol. 93 (2012): cada volumen €80,00 más los gastos de envío.

El *Índice general de Biblica*: para los años 1920-1944 (Vol. 1-25); 1945-1969 (Vol. 26-50); 1970-1994 (Vol. 51-75) cuesta €20,00 más los gastos de envío.

Toda la correspondencia que se refiere a suscripciones, pagos, envíos y cuestiones semejantes debe dirigirse a la Administración:

PONTIFICIO ISTITUTO BIBLICO
GREGORIAN & BIBLICAL PRESS
Piazza della Pilotta, 35 – 00187 Roma, Italia
Tel. (39) 066781567 – Fax (39) 066780588
E-mail: periodicals@biblicum.com

Conto Corrente Postale: IT 21 C 07601 03200 000034903005
Banca Prossima: IT 28 O 03359 01600 100000006102 Swift/Bic BCITITMX

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database,
published by the American
Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr.,
16th Flr. Chicago, IL 60606.

E-mail: atla@atla.com. <http://www.atla.com/>

GIANPAOLO SALVINI, Direttore responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

Finito di stampare nel mese di novembre 2014
da Arti Grafiche Picene - Pomezia (RM)



MISTO

Carta
da fonti gestite in
maniera responsabile

FSC® C108720